Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-087
Thursday
5 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-087 *5 May 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Officials Assess UN Disarmament Talks 1
Kokeyev Views Session 1
Belonogov on 'Soviet Position' 1
Notes Exchanged With FRG on INF Inspections 1
'Evidence' of Improved Ties 1
Envoys Sign Agreement 2
NATO Group Communique on Nuclear Plans Cited *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Sends Letter on Apartheid to UN 3
NATO Exercises Begin in Italy, Mediterranean 3
Trade Union Secretary Speaks on Restructuring 4
Model for Settlement of Third World Conflicts *[Dolgopolov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Chance for Arms Treaty at Summit Receding
[Dadyants in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 3 May] 6
Dobrynin Discusses Summit, Regional Conflicts *[Prague CTK]* 7
Reagan 'Realistic Dialogue', Pre-Summit Stance *[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 May]* 7
Journalist Views Relations, Summit Prospects *[Korionov in PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 9
Reagan Remarks on Human Rights, Religion Viewed 10
Chicago Speech Assailed 10
Speaks to Churchmen 11
U.S. 'Misinformation' on Soviet Weapons Detailed *[Glebov]* 11

China

PRC Stand on Nuclear Disarmament Endorsed *[Alekseyev]* 12
Culture Minister Meets With PRC Counterpart 12
Trade Union Leader Greets PRC Workers 12
Expansion of Sino-Ukrainian Relations Discussed *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 21 Apr]* 13
Food Price Subsidies Introduced in PRC Cities *[PRAVDA 3 May]* 13

Northeast Asia

More on Japanese Communist Delegation in Moscow 13
Gorbachev Makes Arms Statement *[Tokyo KYODO]* 13
Gorbachev Receives Fuwa 14
Dobrynin Welcomes Japanese Socialists 15
Japan 'Firmly Seated' in U.S. 'War Chariot' *[Mulatov]* 15
DPRK's Kim Yong-nam Continues Soviet Visit 16
Received by Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 16
Ends Talks With Shevardnadze 16

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Incursion Into Lebanon Condemned 16
Foreign Ministry Statement 16
U.S. Support Implied 17
'Veritable War' by Israel *[Babenko]* 17
India's Menon Received by Ziaul Haq in Islamabad 18

East Europe

Moscow TV Notes, Comments on Polish Strikes 18
Urban Describes Strikes 18
Western Media 'Distort' Events in Poland 19
Radio, Solidarity Fuel Unrest *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 19
'Unprecedented Propaganda' 20
Bilip Describes Strikes' Effect on Industry *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 20

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Contras Reject Aid Via Red Cross *[PRAVDA 1 May]* 21
Oil Pipeline Construction Contract With Cuba 21
Commercial Bureau Head on Brazilian Trade Ties *[Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO 2 May]* 21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Reaction to Revolutionary Thinking Article *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 23
Equivocation on Newspaper Polemic Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]* 26
Readers Express Conference Fears, Proposals *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 May]* 27
Criticism Must Arouse Desire for Change *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Apr]* 30
'People's Initiative' for Reform Neglected *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 33
Status of Those Injured at Chernobyl Noted *[Hamburg DPA]* 34
Academician Explores Historical Ethnic Issues *[IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]* 34
Unresolved Nationalities Questions Detailed *[TRUD 28 Apr]* 38
'Brezhnev's Special Favor' Protected Corruption *[TRUD 30 Apr]* 40
Inevitability of Stalin Personality Cult Viewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 18]* 41
Ligachev, Zaykov Visit Publishing House 43
Rostov Aides Obstruct Afghan Memorial Event *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 43
Baku Notes May Day, Soviet Sovereignty Date 44
Historians, Writers Conference Speeches Viewed *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 45
Aviation Official on Hijacking, Countermeasures *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]* 46
Silence on Air Crash Findings Criticized *[PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 48

Economic

Deputy Premier Antonov Meets Enterprise Chiefs *[PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 48
Cooperatives Part of 'Profound' Transformations *[PRAVDA 3 May]* 48
Rubber Plant Shut on Environmental Grounds *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 9 Apr]* 50

Agricultural

Gales in Kirghizia Cause 'Substantial Damage' 50
Considerable Flooding Affects Azerbaijan Farms 50
Further on Nikonov's Krasnodar Kray Tour *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Apr]* 50

Scientific

Marchuk Remarks on 'New Age' in Soviet Science *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 21 Apr]* ... 52
Sagdeyev Speaks at Meeting on Space Cooperation 53
Comparison of 'Mir' Cosmonauts' Activities 53

Military

Workers, Servicemen Learn Lessons From Chernobyl *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Apr]* 53
Lizichev, Others Sign Zub Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Apr]* 55
Briefs 55
General Promoted 55

Officials Assess UN Disarmament Talks

Kokeyev Views Session

LD0405140088 Moscow TASS in English 1332 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Mikhail Kokeyev, head of the department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs for disarmament issues being examined at the United Nations, has referred to the U.N. Disarmament Commission's session taking place in New York as not an ordinary one.

In an interview with TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev he said this character of the session is determined by positive changes which have become visible in the process of real disarmament and the role which the U.N. commission is playing as part of the international machinery in the field of disarmament. The current session also acquires special importance in view of the fact that the preparation for the U.N. General Assembly's third special session (opening on May 31) on disarmament issues is entering the finishing straight.

The Soviet Union holds, the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out, that there is a unique opportunity at this forum to secure headway towards intensification and internationalisation of efforts in the field of disarmament. This appears quite realistic: The concept of security through disarmament, which was formulated in the final document of the U.N. General Assembly's first special session on disarmament, becomes a political reality due to the Soviet-U.S. INF treaty, and a prospect is opening up for the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and for a transition to a nuclear-weapon-free and nonviolent world and to lowering military potentials down to a reasonable sufficiency level.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption, Mikhail Kokeyev went on to say, that the session may give a powerful impetus to headway in all main directions of disarmament through pooling the international community's efforts which would be mutually complemented by bilateral actions of the Soviet Union and the United States. A regular, 26th meeting of the foreign ministers of the USSR and the USA will be held during the current session of the U.N. Commission for Disarmament and during preparation for a special session of the U.N. General Assembly. "We", the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said, "set great hopes upon it and continue to do everything for the historic opportunity to conclude an agreement on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms to be realised as soon as possible".

"The Soviet side still proceeds from the premise that this could be done at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow, which will coincide with the opening of the special session. Such outcome of the summit meeting would accord with the tasks facing the special session and would promote the development of a wide ranging constructive dialogue on disarmament issues and on military aspects of a comprehensive system of international security. This would confirm once again that the process of real nuclear disarmament has not only been started but develops successfully, too, and becomes an asset of the entire international community, embodying a balance of the countries' interests".

Belonogov on 'Soviet Position'

LD0305230788 Moscow Tass in English 2148 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] New York May 3 TASS—General discussion continues at the session of the U.N. Disarmament Commission, under way at the headquarters of this world body. Soviet permanent representative at the U.N. Aleksandr Belonogov set forth the Soviet position today.

The obtaining political situation, he noted, objectively dictates the need to put into action all mechanisms in the field of disarmament, both bilateral and multilateral. The forthcoming ratification of the INF Treaty will only give the signal to start nuclear disarmament. The elimination of 4-5 per cent of nuclear weapons only marks the beginning of the road to a nuclear-free, secure future. But this beginning is highly promising and holds out a prospect for achieving an agreement on a radical cut in nuclear arsenals.

"We proceed from the need to prevent the arms race in outer space," Aleksandr Belonogov continued. The program of peaceful cooperation, including future plans to create the world space organisation, is aimed exactly at this. One of the key tasks in curbing the nuclear arms race must be a ban on nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union takes persistent efforts to start practical work on this problem within the framework of the conference on disarmament, proposes to work out a draft of the relevant multisided agreement within the shortest possible time.

Dwelling in detail on the problems of reducing naval forces and conventional weapons, ways of carrying out confidence-building measures and verification of compliance with the agreements on restricting and eliminating armaments, the Soviet representative stressed that the interests of creating a nuclear-free and non-violent world call for strengthening the role of the United Nations, consistently implementing the U.N. General Assembly resolutions on disarmament.

Notes Exchanged With FRG on INF Inspections

'Evidence' of Improved Ties

LD0405134188 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 4 May 88

["Notes on Inspections Under INF Treaty Exchanged Between USSR and FRG"—TASS headline]

[Text] Bonn, 4 May (TASS)—A ceremony of exchanging notes between the USSR and the FRG confirming the issue of holding inspections on Federal Republic territory in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the

Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles took place in Bonn today. Taking part in it on the Soviet side was Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR ambassador to the FRG, and on the West German side Hans-Dietrich Genscher, foreign affairs minister.

The exchange of notes, Genscher declared, is an important political step that creates preconditions for monitoring the fulfillment of the INF Treaty on FRG territory. The significance of this step exceeds the disarmament and arms control sphere. It is a result of the progress attained over the last few years between East and West and at the same time provides evidence of improved bilateral relations between the FRG and the USSR, pointed out Genscher.

Envoys Sign Agreement

LD0405213888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent in the FRG reports:

[V. Kondratyev, identified by caption] Bonn, the Federal Republic's Foreign Ministry. A noteworthy event in the general process of disarmament took place here today: The FRG and the Soviet Union exchanged notes on holding inspections of West German territory in connection with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. After the treaty has been ratified and has come into force, the FRG will guarantee Soviet inspectors access, under the terms of today's accord, to that country, where they will visit the establishments where the missiles subject to destruction are sited. [video shows exterior of a building, presumably the Foreign Ministry in Bonn; Genscher and Kvitsinskiy, flanked by a group of officials, signing documents, then rising to shake hands]

The mechanism for mutual verification that has been worked out is calculated to cover a period of 13 years. The road to the historic decision was long and difficult. The discussions and negotiations on the Pershing-2's, the cruise missiles, and the Pershing-1A's in the armory of the Bundeswehr had a fundamental influence on the attitude of the FRG public to the issues of war and peace. A decisive improvement, which opened up the prospect of the elimination of whole classes of lethal weapons, occurred after the Soviet Union put forward the program for the creation of a non-nuclear world. [video shows servicemen at work on missiles, missiles standing in open ground and in wooded areas, an anti-nuclear demonstration, and missiles on board military transporters]

Comrade Kvitsinskiy, the Soviet ambassador to Bonn, spoke about that today. He stressed the FRG's constructive contribution toward the attainment of mutual understanding, thanks to its position on the Pershing-1A missiles. The Soviet Union is prepared, the ambassador stated, to proceed further along this path. It will not let up in its efforts in the matter of concluding new important agreements.

Foreign Minister Genscher provided a high evaluation of the documents signed today, which transfer the fundamental breakthrough in the sphere of arms control and disarmament onto a practical plane. He stated the FRG's support for a 50-percent reduction in strategic missiles and came out in favor of the earliest possible worldwide ban on chemical weapons and of stability in conventional arms on the continent. [video shows Kvitsinskiy and Genscher speaking at the venue of the signing, separately and from notes; photographers and cameramen at work] Increase the accumulated capital of constructive partnership, do not squander it: in this spirit, today's accord lends a beneficial impetus to Soviet-West German cooperation, which is deepening in all spheres.

NATO Group Communique on Nuclear Plans Cited

PM011315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 7

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "NATO Military Plans"]

[Text] Brussels, 28 Apr—The NATO Nuclear Planning Group's sessions continued for 2 days in Brussels. A final communique was adopted. It confirms once again that the NATO "deterrence strategy" is based on both conventional and nuclear arms. The communique also states that NATO will preserve and improve its nuclear forces in Europe in accordance with the program adopted in the Canadian city of Montebello in 1983. This applies, above all, to the U.S. tactical nuclear weapons sited in a number of West European contries, which were not affected by the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

Speaking at a press conference, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington and U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci declared that the "modernization" of NATO tactical nuclear missiles is being carried out as envisaged in Montebello. It is a question of the development of systems which are to replace the Lance missiles so as to considerably increase their range, of the creation of new nuclear missiles of the "air-to-ground" class, and so forth. The Western press bluntly calls these NATO plans an attempt to "get around" the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

F. Carlucci pointed out that the session participants advocated the speediest U.S. ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and he said that he will bring this viewpoint to the notice of the U.S. Congress.

Shevardnadze Sends Letter on Apartheid to UN

LD0505094788 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Follows the full text of a message by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to the U.N. Special Committee Against Apartheid:

"The U.N. Special Committee against apartheid is marking the 25th anniversary of its activity, aimed at pooling the efforts of the international community in the struggle for the elimination of the apartheid system in South Africa.

"The stubborn unwillingness of Pretoria rulers to put an end to the policy of racial discrimination, oppression, repressions, and terror against those fighting this inhuman system and to halt the illegal occupation of Namibia—all this turned the situation in southern Africa into a destabilising factor of international significance.

"The apartheid system would long have sunk in the Lethe if not for the aiding and abetting of the racist regime by the more reactionary circles in the West. They seem not to be embarassed at all by the fact that the policy and actions of the South African regime were condemned by the United Nations as a flagrant violation of the U.N. Charter, of the generally recognised principles and norms of international law, as a threat to peace and security, a crime against humanity.

"An explosive situation persists in southern Africa. To defuse it there is an urgent need to realise the relevant decisions of the U.N. and the Security Council, as well as to impose the all-embracing mandatory sanctions as stipulated under Article 7 of the U.N. Charter.

"A resolute, more concerted position of the international community in the struggle against apartheid is exactly what is needed today to break the deadlock in the course of the political settlement in southern Africa on the basis of balanced interests of all countries involved in the regional conflict here. Underlying the settlement, we see such decisions which would help strengthen independence, freedom and security of all countries of the region.

"The role which the United Nations played in reaching an agreement on the settlement around Afghanistan is a good example and incentive to fresh efforts in achieving the political settlement of international conflicts in various parts of the world.

"The situation in southern Africa makes it incumbent on all members of the United Nations, who cherish the goals and ideals of this organisation, to step up the efforts in defense of the righteous course of the people of South Africa who favour the elimination of the hateful system of apartheid, in support of the patriots of Namibia fighting for the independence of their country, and to rebuff the policy of aggression and subversion pursued by South African racists against the 'Front-Line' States. The Soviet Union will continue to exert efforts to achieve a just and lasting settlement in southern Africa in the interests of peaceful life and prosperity of the peoples of this part of the world.

"It is my conviction that the U.N. Special Committee against apartheid will continue making a weighty contribution to the world community efforts aimed at eliminating such an anachronism of our time as the apartheid regime in South Africa."

NATO Exercises Begin in Italy, Mediterranean

LD0405072888 Moscow TASS in English 0623 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Rome May 4 TASS—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Tarakanov reports:

NATO's large-scale "Dragon Hammer-88" exercises began in the southern areas of Italy today. The exercises are involving ground units as well as the aircraft of NATO countries, including those of France and Spain which are formally not members of NATO's military structure.

Cooperative action between the air force and ground units of the allies, aimed at enhancing NATO's "defence might in the event of the use of conventional arms" will be war-gamed during the exercises which will continue till May 14.

Simultaneously NATO is holding a whole series of naval exercises codenamed "Deterrent Force-88" in various parts of the Mediterranean. The exercises are involving ships of the United States, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, and Turkey, which are part of the special Mediterranean quick-reaction "Navocformed" squadron set up in 1969 in order to demonstrate, as the ANSA news agency points out, the capability of the countries of the Atlantic bloc to guarantee the right to free navigation in neutral waters.

In the coming days "Navocformed" ships will enter into cooperation with the aviation and units taking part in the "Dragon Hammer-88" exercises. The landing of a three-thousand-strong amphibious force on Sardinia island is planned, for example. In mid-May the naval and air "battles" with the use of the newest electronic equipment and up-to-date equipment for detection and destruction of the enemy will move from Tyrrhenian Sea and the western part of the Ionian Sea to the shores of Turkey.

NATO's 36th Mediterranean exercises with the participation of the "Navocformed" will end on May 18.

Trade Union Secretary Speaks on Restructuring
LD291454 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Perestroyka in the USSR is meant to settle the accumulated differences, obliterate everything that is of interim nature and has outlived itself, restore the unpassing values of the socialist system and the Leninist concept of socialism, said Gennadiy Yanayev. The secretary of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (AUCCTU) today spoke at an international trade union conference, "Perestroyka, New Thinking and Trade Unions", in session here. The hopes of our adversaries that the current developments in our country are an aberration from socialism are futile, he said.

The realities of the nuclear-space age are such that a global military conflict can no longer be a means of attaining political objectives: There can be no winners in a nuclear war, said Yanayev when touching on the international situation. The way to the future lies through disarmament. The first and, therefore, highly important steps were taken in this direction today.

The INF Treaty laid down the foundation of the disarmament infrastructure. The forms and methods of this process were successfully elaborated and the principles of mutual verification and the host of confidence-building measures without which there can be no movement forward were agreed upon as the work on the treaty proceeded.

The recent signing in Geneva of the agreement on a political settlement in Afghanistan, which signals an important breakthrough in settling regional conflicts, is one more telling example of the constructive nature of the new thinking.

Trade unions have an immense role to play in normalizing the international situation. In soberly evaluating the situation, which has formed in the world trade union movement today, it is admissible and reasonable to put forward the unity of action as a slogan of the day. At issue is open and equitable partnership of all trends in the world working class and trade union movement in solving specific problems that are vitally important for all rather than an ideological compromise, the AUCCTU secretary stressed.

Model for Settlement of Third World Conflicts
WA18070090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 p 5

[Article by Major General of the Reserves Ye. Dolgopolov, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences: "From the Position of New Thinking; National Reconciliation: Hopes and Worries"]

[Text] Afghanistan, Cambodia, Nicaragua... The causes which gave rise to conflicts in these and other countries are diverse. At the same time, all were the result of outside interference after the overthrow of reactionary regimes in these countries at the end of the seventies. Armed struggle, unleashed by forces of imperialism and regional reaction, took away many thousands of human lives and brought colossal material loss, which hindered these countries' socioeconomic development.

In these conditions, the patriotic and realistic policy of national reconciliation is aimed not only at ceasing armed conflict but also at concentrating the efforts of the broadest national masses to resolve urgent tasks of construction.

The very idea of national reconciliation has ripened in different ways. Afghanistan, for example, since June 1982, participated in negotiations with Pakistan in Geneva, through the good offices of the United Nations secretary general, on settling the crisis which had arisen. This process received a new push in January 1987 when the Afghan leadership put forth constructive and far-reaching proposals, aimed at overcoming the lingering conflict.

Statements by the Soviet and Afghan leaders on 8 February 1988 and their meeting in Tashkent on 7 February 1988 provided the decisive impulse for resolving the crisis, allowing the process for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan to be brought to a conclusive stage.

In Cambodia the fundamental conditions for a national reconciliation policy were preliminarily examined in July 1987 by the SRV minister of foreign affairs, representing the Indochinese countries, and the Indonesian minister of foreign affairs, representing the ASEAN countries. Later these agreements were affirmed in Cambodian Government statements in August and October 1987. As for the situation around Nicaragua, it was precisely the constructive position of the latter which made possible the achievement of an agreement in August 1987 between five Central American countries—Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador—on a political settlement of the regional situation.

The policy of national reconciliation is already bearing positive fruits that inspire hope for the possibility of ending the completely unjustified bloodshed in several countries.

The 14 April 1988 signing of the Geneva agreement on Afghanistan, in accordance with which Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan begins on 15 May, served as an important break in the chain of regional conflicts. The Soviet Government statement on 26 April 1988 underlines how the future fate of the Afghanistan political settlement depends now on how responsibly, consistently, and vigorously the sides will realize the whole set of obligations they took upon themselves.

In Cambodia a peaceful situation prevails on the greater part of the country's territory; military activity breaks out for short periods of time in separate regions. Many members of the opposition have abandoned their factions in order to unite with the people. Repatriation of Cambodian refugees from Thailand is being prepared; readiness was expressed for constructive negotiations with all Khmer factions, excluding Pol Pot and his closest accomplices. In Nicaragua, despite constant pressure from the United States and the armed opposition, the understandings reached in August 1987 are being strictly carried out. A commission for national reconciliation was created and is successfully working in the country. The state of emergency was revoked, and the anti-Somozist tribunals were disbanded. Freedom of the press was restored and censorship abolished; meetings of any political groups may be conducted freely, and the organization of rallies and demonstrations is permitted. The government is conducting a dialogue with the opposition and has begun direct negotiations with the contras on ceasing military activities. Proposals have been made several times to the United States to conduct a direct exchange of opinions, without mediators, with the goal of normalizing relations between the two countries.

The idea of national reconciliation is spreading. Thus, the Angolan leadership, conducting a policy of national unity, is expanding its dialogue with the armed opposition, except for the UNITA bandits who are supported by racist South Africa. A willingness has been expressed to reduce the number of Cuban troops in Angola, who were introduced there at Angola's request to defend the country from external aggression. In July 1987 a proposal was put forth envisioning the conclusion of an agreement between the Governments of Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) under the aegis of the UN Security Council or its five permanent members with the goal of achieving independence for Namibia.

On the whole, the situation today favors a peaceful resolution of crises. However, militant imperialist circles continue feverishly to search for means to make it possible to artificially maintain tension; they pile up any kind of far-fetched obstacles on the path of political settlement of regional conflicts.

It is impossible, for example, not to prick up one's ears when hearing that the American Administration actually announced a program to continue military deliveries to factions fighting against the legal Afghanistan Government. It is especially intolerable that leaders of the armed opposition persist in their unwillingness to recognize the results of the Geneva process and refuse to cease military activities.

The process of political settlement around Nicaragua is meeting with no lesser difficulties. A new round of negotiations has just begun between the government and the leadership of the armed counter-revolution on questions of achieving a final cease-fire. However, as Nicaraguan Minister of Defense H. Ortega pointed out, the main obstacle for their successful prosecution is the Reagan Administration's aggressive policy toward the Republic. The so-called "Nicaraguan resistance" is carrying on an active struggle against the Sandinist government, striving in every way possible to break negotiations.

The cause of a political settlement of the situation in Angola and southern Africa as a whole has practically not moved forward. South Africa is not only still refusing to respond in any way to Angola's and Cuba's reasonable proposals, but it has launched new offensive operations, attempting to seize new territory. At the same time, UNITA puppets based on South African and U.S. support have stepped up their activity, proclaiming the creation of their own "government." As before, the granting of Namibian independence is tied to withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

A time of hope and worry—thus, it may be possible to briefly describe this crucial stage through which countries, where the process of national reconciliation is developing, are living. The hope is for a more rapid end to the bloodshed and the possibility to return to a peaceful, constructive life. The worry is for the fates of their countries as a whole. However, it is possible to be sure that in the final account, the peoples themselves will make the decisive choice, which only they alone have the sovereign right to do.

United States & Canada

Chance for Arms Treaty at Summit Receding

PM0505105388 Moscow
SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian
3 May 88 p 3

[Article by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants: "Before the Fourth Summit"]

[Text] Scarcely more than 3 weeks remain until the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow. It is clear that this is an event beside which all other facts of international life pale into insignificance.

By and large the situation prevailing before this Soviet-U.S. summit—the fourth since 1985—could be described as favorable. The Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, guaranteed by the USSR and the United States, followed in the wake of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Consequently, the deadlock has been broken not only as regards the problem of disarmament, but also the solution of regional conflicts. There are changes in the sphere of humanitarian cooperation and greater understanding of one another's positions on human rights. Productive dialogue is being organized between the Soviet and U.S. public, which is making it possible to overcome the notorious "enemy image." The American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council session held in Moscow showed the great reserves latent in trade and economic cooperation, including the creation of joint enterprises; in other words, there is a chance of putting material foundations under the political dialogue.

Nonetheless, it would seem that despite the outwardly favorable course of events, it would be incorrect to succumb to political romanticism in connection with the upcoming Moscow meeting. There are still many clouds, large and small, on the international horizon. In his recent speech at Springfield, President Reagan once again fell back on the old stereotypes in assessing Soviet foreign policy, talking about Soviet "expansionism" and "aggressiveness." Furthermore, he tried to teach the Soviet leadership how to behave in the international arena. In effect, he demanded that the organization of more normal East-West relations be made conditional on a change in our country's domestic setup.

You could, of course, regard Reagan's pronouncements as mere obeisance to U.S. right-wing forces who are alarmed by the general improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, as a kind of verbal guarantee that he will act from a "position of strength" in Moscow. But, unfortunately, we are dealing not only with an excess of superfluous words, but also a lack of useful actions. A month before the summit, many questions which are to be discussed in Moscow have still not been resolved. This applies primarily to the main question—an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments while observing the ABM Treaty.

The U.S. press believes that the main topic of disagreement between the two sides is the "Star Wars" program: the question of what limits should be set on the testing of ABM systems in space. Even after the latest round of talks between the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers, no key had been found to solving the problems of long-range sea-launched cruise missiles, air-launched cruise missiles, mobile ICBM's, and also the monitoring and verification system as a whole. Both sides have voiced only certain new ideas and only individual questions have been amplified.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, at the recent meeting in Moscow the United States and the Soviet Union "made just enough progress to conclude that the talks on a new strategic arms treaty are making progress; however, the sides made insufficient progress to ensure that there is a good chance of this treaty being concluded this year."

The presence of disagreements between the USSR and the United States on the question of a strategic offensive arms treaty is natural and is not in itself a cause for alarm, since these disagreements could be overcome given the political will. Whether our partners in the talks have such political will is another matter. In that case, the processes retarding the Geneva talks and the desire to shelve the conclusion of a strategic offensive arms agreement appear in a different light. A definite policy is always to be found behind diplomacy, and behind the policy—those who make it.

Evidently, the forces opposing 50-percent reductions in strategic nuclear armaments are extremely active in the United States, but they are also exerting strong pressure on President Reagan.

In particular, the vehement adherents of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative," whose implementation would effectively undermine the possibility of an agreement on strategic offensive armaments, are still in there fighting. Today's planned tests by the Pentagon within the SDI framework clearly violate the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty—or, as M. Bann [name as published], a leading expert in the U.S. Arms Control Association, has stated, "they will undermine the restrictions set by the treaty, owing to the creation of areas of 'dual' or 'ambiguous interpretation'." In the opinion of U.S. experts, perfecting the use of infrared sensors mounted on Boeing-767's to detect and track ballistic missiles and determine the nature of their warheads would be a flagrant violation of the ABM Treaty. The testing of space interceptors mounted on Midgetman missiles would also be a violation of the treaty.

Pentagon haste—the desire to rush ahead with the creation of so-called "defensive armaments" and thus bar the way to the elimination of offensive armaments—is behind the sluggishness of U.S. diplomacy in Geneva. Let us recall that an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments is conditional upon the observance of the ABM Treaty for a mutually agreed period.

Political observers worldwide describe President Reagan's upcoming visit to Moscow as his last appearance on the stage of world politics. His place in history depends on the result of this meeting. If an agreement on strategic offensive armaments is not signed, the "peacemaker's" laurels will have to be left to his successor.

As for the Soviet position in connection with the upcoming summit, this is clear. We want this meeting to be a major landmark continuing the line of Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington and establishing still further the principles of the new thinking in the international arena.

Dobrynin Discusses Summit, Regional Conflicts
LD0505121888 Prague CTK in English 1124 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Prague May 5 (CTK)—The latest issue of the Czechoslovak Communist Party weekly TVORBA carries an extensive interview with Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin on the Soviet-American summit to be held in Moscow from May 29 to June 2.

Dealing with the question of the signing of a treaty on 50 per cent cuts in strategic weapons during the summit the Soviet representative said: "The Soviet side is convinced that it would still be technically possible for experts in Geneva to prepare the text of the agreement before Reagan's arrival in Moscow. However, it is evident that the treaty will not be signed now in Moscow. Several of the five basic problems have not yet been solved: compliance with the 1972 ABM Treaty for the agreed period, sea and air launched cruise missiles, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles and verification systems. Certain progress has been achieved but the Americans are now marking time in Geneva, they are in no hurry as regards the legal arrangement of the principles adopted during the Washington meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan".

"We hope that the INF Treaty will be ratified before the forthcoming summit. We also hope that the treaty will be approved without any changes and supplements though American senators are used to come with all kinds of amendments which can change the basis of the whole treaty", Dobrynin said.

He further stressed that the Soviet Union regards a ban on nuclear testing as one of the most important questions but that the Americans are against a complete ban.

In another part of the interview carried by TVORBA Anatoliy Dobrynin dealt with regional conflicts which will also be on the agenda of the Moscow summit and said that the Middle East will be a significant point.

"What the Israelis are now doing in the occupied territories requires an action of the international community", he stressed. Speaking about the U.S. Middle East plan he said that it reflects that the Americans are well aware of the necessity to solve this conflict.

"They admit the need for a conference on the Middle East but it should serve only as an umbrella under which the delegations would meet but negotiate only on the basis of bilateral talks but are of the opinion that it should not be the only aim of the conference. All countries involved should take part in it and an impulse for holding it should be given by the Security Council. Besides, the American plan does not recognize the PLO and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination. It is a complicated issue and there are multiple manoeuvres around it. It should be solved in a peaceful political way. The best example is Afghanistan—we have in mind the policy of national reconciliation. The same applies also to other regions, for instance Nicaragua, southern Africa", Anatoliy Dobrynin underlined.

Reagan 'Realistic Dialogue', Pre-Summit Stance
PM0405101588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Observer Aleksandr Golts Military-Political Review: "Discarding Stereotypes of the Past"]

[Text] ...Spring is in full swing over the earth. And it is manifested not only and not so much in flowering nature. After all, it is not for nothing that this time of year is called a time of hope. On 1 May the planet's working people marched through the city and village streets and squares to speak out loud of their hopes and of their desire to struggle for their implementation. The word "peace," written in different languages, dominated the May Day posters.

Well, this year the peoples' will for a secure future has been reinforced more impressively than ever before. It is manifested primarily in the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which laid the foundation for the nuclear disarmament process. Of interest on this plane is the report that the West German Liebherr-Werk Ehingen firm, together with a Soviet enterprise, is drawing up plans to install enormous construction cranes on automatic platforms where missiles are deployed at present. A symbolic change!

In terms of importance, the agreement on the political settlement around Afghanistan is on a par with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. In both cases, success became possible because of the sides' readiness to consider each other's interests. Of course,

these documents are only the first steps to a nuclear-free world and to the planet's salvation from the repellent sores of regional conflicts. Today mankind hopes that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow will be marked by specific and major new results.

But just as the present spring in Moscow was marred by a snowfall of unknown provenance, so the emergent trend toward the warming of the international atmosphere is being overcast by the icy winds of confrontation which have suddenly started to blow from Washington. I have in mind the U.S. President's recent speeches. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has described them in a previous military-political review, so I will merely recall that in his speeches, the White House incumbent turned to attempts—seemingly eradicated from the practice of interstate relations—to accuse our country of every mortal sin: of expansionism, of the desire for military superiority, and of some violations of human rights. All the positive changes in the international climate were categorically viewed as the result of U.S. pressure on the USSR, of the "from a position of strength" policy. Yet again the United States was presented as the ideal, the notorious shining city on the hill, from which all other countries and peoples can learn.

It must be said that these statements were an unpleasant surprise not only to us Soviet people. Last week both U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and White House press spokesman M. Fitzwater were deluged with questions from journalists interested in why exactly the U.S. President had begun to behave so provocatively on the eve of the Moscow meeting. It followed from their not overlogical explanations that R. Reagan's speech was by no means an accident, but a manifestation of the approach which this year is called "realistic dialogue" with the USSR. It comes down to the idea that it is precisely now, just weeks before the meeting, that it is necessary to concentrate not on seeking ways to bring our positions closer on the questions under discussion but, on the contrary, on issuing ultimatums to our country.

I shall say frankly that even under a microscope it is impossible to discern either realism or the desire for dialogue in this approach. In actual fact, surely we cannot discuss seriously, for instance, the President's statement that the condition for establishing normal relations between the USSR and the United States is "the ending of the Soviets' oppression of their people." This can only be viewed as an attempt to force the Soviet leaders yet again to engage in "elementary political teaching," explaining to the President the existing realities which must be taken into account.

This approach is all the more suspect in that it is also being manifested at talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. Recent statements by U.S. spokesmen on this score obviously attest to the desire to slow down the pace of the talks.

It is no secret what exactly forced the administration to behave like this: There is an attempt here to please the extreme right-wing forces in an election year and the desire to prove to everyone and perhaps also to themselves that, despite the reality, "Reagan has remained Reagan." The main thing is the desire in this way to shake our country's mounting prestige. And these attempts displayed a highly characteristic feature of confrontationist policy. He who acts while guided by the stereotypes of the past inevitably has to resort to misinformation. Here is just one example. A few years ago, attempting to prove the existence of "Soviet expansionism," Reagan cited the "precepts of N. Lenin"—a falsehood already invented by Goebbels' propaganda. This time they dragged out a statement allegedly made by an unnamed Soviet leader. He allegedly told a French politician that the USSR "has seized the developing countries one after the other, taking advantage of the West's lack of political will." No "weightier" proof is cited.

At the same time as the President's revelations, Western propaganda brought down on its audience a veritable barrage of misinformation regarding the Soviet Union's true intentions. A leading role in this malevolent chorus was assigned to the Pentagon. The latest edition, the seventh, of "Soviet Military Power" has just been published in the U.S. capital. This time the military department's propagandists did not restrict themselves to their usual attempts to substantiate the thesis of Soviet military superiority with the aid of manipulations and juggling. They embarked on analyzing the influence of restructuring and glasnost on Soviet policy. As a result, they reached the profound conclusion that with the aid of the new thinking, "Moscow is trying to divert attention from Soviet militarism and adventurism in foreign policy."

Moreover, it turns out that nothing else is to be expected of the Russians. After all, in the opinion of the Pentagon men, "Russian civilization has not absorbed fundamental Western concepts like constitutionality, democratic rule, human rights, or freedom of choice." Consequently, the authors of this lampoon assert, the only thing the Soviets have on their mind is the desire to seize half the world. As proof they cite the map invented in the U.S. military department showing the military operations the Soviet Union allegedly intends to carry out in Eurasia. The Pentagon artists were unstinting in their use of black and red arrows showing the seizure of both continents. "As of now," U.S. Defense Secretary Carlucci states in the preface to the anthology, without a trace of embarrassment, "we have seen no evidence that the USSR is changing the offensive nature of the structure and deployment of its armed forces."

It is hard to say what this anthology contains more of: deliberate misinformation or sheer ignorance and the reluctance to see the real changes on the planet. After all, such wild allegations are being made after our country has spoken of the strictly defensive nature of Soviet

military doctrine. At a recent meeting with foreign diplomats, Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, pointed to the key provisions of the military doctrine which reveal its defensive orientation most graphically. He mentioned the program for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of the century, the reduction of conventional armaments to the minimum, and the restriction of the sides' military potentials to the limits of a sufficiency ensuring the solution only of defensive tasks. Yet the Pentagon propagandists are continuing to trumpet about the "Soviet military threat."

Unfortunately, misinformation is becoming an increasingly marked factor of the military-political situation. A session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group has just ended. The defense ministers of 14 NATO countries gathered in a rather nervous atmosphere. They intended to discuss the bloc's strategy after the elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. In the opinion of the NATO strategists and above all U.S. strategists, the slightly more than 4,000 nuclear munitions remaining in their possession are "not enough" to close the breaches allegedly forming in the alliance's defense. That is why Washington is actively pushing through plans for the modernization of existing nuclear forces and for the deployment of an additional number of sea-launched and air-launched cruise missiles. But the resolution of the Danish parliament demanding that ships carrying nuclear weapons should be banned from the country's ports and territorial waters left its mark on the session.

And the Pentagon chief was also faced with a complex task: persuading the allies to build up their nuclear potential at a time when some of them want to rid themselves of nuclear death in general. To cope with the set task, he resorted to the same old method: to misinformation. Carlucci tried to intimidate his interlocutors by claiming that the Soviet Union is already targeting its strategic missiles on Western Europe. And although the falsification was immediately refuted by responsible representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry, it had done its job. According to the information of the London TIMES, behind the cautious formulas of the session's final communique one can clearly discern one more step by NATO toward the modernization of nuclear weapons and the buildup of its nuclear potential in Europe.

Adherence to the stereotypes of the past is manifested not only in words but also in specific military programs. THE WASHINGTON POST attests that the development of plans for victory in a "protracted nuclear war" is continuing deep inside the Pentagon. It emerges from a secret directive published by the newspaper that the U.S. strategic nuclear forces are being set the task of "promoting the completion of military actions under conditions advantageous to the United States and keeping a nuclear offensive potential in reserve under any conditions so that the United States does not leave the war with no nuclear weapons." It surpasses understanding: The Pentagon wants to preserve nuclear weapons for World War IV!

THE WASHINGTON POST points out that the Pentagon is preparing to deliver strikes against "hard" targets on the USSR's territory—missile silos and other defended military targets—and against "soft" targets, that is, cities. These senseless plans are combined in a striking and sinister way with the "tough" statements of the U.S. President lauding "peace from a position of strength."

"Someone should tell the Pentagon that the concept of a victorious nuclear war contains mutually exclusive ideas," the article's authors write. "Our defense department should finally have enough sense to realize that there can be no protracted nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union." It remains to be added that these extremely sensible words come from J. Anderson and D. Van Atta, journalists whom, however much you may want to, you cannot count among the USSR's friends.

The danger which looms over the planet was by no means imaginary. And to eliminate it, mutual trust and mutual respect are essential. Reluctance to consider the interests of others or political realities, disregard for the principle of the balance of interests can prevent the solution of problems of vital importance for all peoples. In brief, it is time for the U.S. side to resolutely discard yesterday's stereotypes, to look without prejudice at present-day realities, and to begin to work for the future. That is what the Soviet Union proposes.

Journalist Views Relations, Summit Prospects

PM0505133588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "Journalist's Notes": "Spring on the Planet"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Socialist peace policy is not confined to any one region. Its aim is a non-nuclear, nonviolent world on the planet. However, it is indisputable that emerging onto the path of the establishment of constructive USSR-U.S. relations is extremely important here.

Many barriers to this are being erected deliberately. For 15 years no Soviet-U.S. summit meetings took place. For 5 years the incumbent Washington Administration rejected the very thought of such a meeting. But how noticeably the world has changed! In the last 3 years or less there have been three Soviet-U.S. summit meetings. Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington have become a kind of "school of higher education in the new thinking," especially for those who were calling for a "crusade"

against the USSR. In less than a month, the next USSR-U.S. summit talks will take place in Moscow. The two states' foreign ministers have met 25 times in the last 3 years or so. A number of tight knots have been untangled.

A great deal has been achieved. But should we rest content with this? No, we shouldn't. I now want to express my personal opinion. The political maneuvers recently stepped up in Washington even around the ratification of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles are attracting attention. It looks as if some people would like to turn this treaty into a kind of card in the election campaign unfolding in the United States. The Republican administration signed the treaty and submitted it to Congress for examination, thereby as it were shifting future responsibility onto Congress, where, as is well known, Democrats are now in the majority. Democrats are now beginning to make statements to the effect that there is no need for haste and that some substantial "amendments" need to be made to the treaty, and so on and so forth. What is happening? The Republican "Moor" has served his term and acquired his political capital. If the treaty "is marking time", then the Democrats are to blame. Why do the latter not understand this? Can campaign considerations really be gaining the upper hand? Where then is the sense of responsibility for the fate of general peace?

It looks as if this game is also being stepped up during preparations for an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments. Although there is indeed little time left for it to be drafted, given the goodwill a good document could nonetheless still be prepared.

You cannot help noticing that the White House has in recent weeks mounted an earnest propaganda campaign, artificially highlighting such questions as the problem of the "openness of Soviet society," "human rights violations" in the USSR, and so on. The question inevitably arises: Why is this being done on the eve of the Moscow summit?

Soviet people, like millions of people of good will from every corner of the planet, want to believe that the historic chance opened up by the conclusion of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will not be missed.

Soviet-U.S. relations, consequently, are still at a crossroads where it is difficult to maintain one's position. The danger of slipping into confrontation once more is a real one. [passage omitted].

Reagan Remarks on Human Rights, Religion Viewed

Chicago Speech Assailed

LD0405232188 Moscow TASS in English 2308 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Washington May 4 TASS—President Reagan today delivered in Chicago a lengthy speech devoted in its entirety to matters of human rights in the context of Soviet-American relations.

Addressing members of the public organization "National Strategy Forum", the head of the White House exerted considerable effort to present the state of affairs with political rights in the USA in a most favourable light.

The President asserted that "no government may violate" fundamental political rights recorded in the U.S. Constitution: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press. But it is precisely under the current administration that a large-scale onslaught was launched on all these "freedoms". Prominent American publicist Anthony Lewis noted four years ago that from the time the Reagan Administration had come to power it had been waging a campaign to deny the public the information about the government's activity. Prominent lawyer Floyd Abrams is of the opinion that the current administration is, apparently, against the fundamental provision of the first amendment to the Constitution of the USA which declares that the principles of democracy require that citizens have access to information.

The President said the Americans enjoyed the right to freely assemble. But, as it was documentedly proved recently, agents from 52 departments of the FBI have been conducting active surveillance from 1981 to 1985 of over 180 various public, religious and anti-war organizations protesting against the policy of the administration in Central America. Under the pretext of "combatting terrorism" FBI agents were present at meetings, photographed participants in demonstrations, eavesdropped on their telephone conservations. Lawyers from the Center for Constitutional Rights noted that the door to such abuses by intelligence agencies was opened by Executive Order Number 12333 signed by President Reagan in 1981. It actually sanctioned large-scale operations for the surveillance of Americans, even if they are not suspected of violating law.

The President asserted that in the United States "the government is the servant of the people, and not the other way around". But the record of the Reagan administration shows it is not always that Washington heeds the voice of the people. Thus over seven years from 50 to 70 per cent of Americans have been constantly declaring against aid to Nicaraguan contras. But the White House ignored the will of the majority of the Americans. It organized a secret operation, bypassing law, to supply armaments to the contras. The revelation of that secret operation caused a political scandal without precedent since the times of the Watergate. There are many such examples.

Reagan had to admit that the situation is unfavourable in the area of social and economic rights in the USA. "Yes, the United States has social and economic shortcomings", the President said. He mentioned among them unemployment, racial discrimination, said that

"homelessness is indeed a problem, an agonizing one". But the President asserted that these problems "belong to an essentially different category from civil and political rights".

President Reagan expressed a doubt that the drafting of the treaty on 50 per cent cuts in the arsenals of strategic arms of the USSR and the USA will be concluded by the beginning of Soviet-American summit in Moscow due on May 29.

After speaking at the National Strategy Forum on Wednesday, the President said that this agreement was much more complicated than the INF Treaty and that it was doubtful it would be prepared for the signing at the Moscow summit. Reagan said many matters related to verification and other such things remained unresolved. Therefore, he said, the U.S. wish to sign the treaty on strategic offensive arms at the coming Moscow summit may possibly not be realized.

Speaks to Churchmen

LD0405231788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Washington, 4 May (TASS)—United States President Ronald Reagan has delivered a speech to a group of churchmen at the White House. In his speech, the position of believers in the Soviet Union was reflected as though in a distorting mirror. He began with a belated appeal that "the right of religion be guaranteed for all the peoples of the Soviet Union and the representatives of all faiths"—"belated" insomuch as Article 52 of the USSR Constitution states: "The citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess any religion or not to profess any religion."

At the same time, the head of the U.S. Administration acknowledged that the policy of glasnost and the process of restructuring in the Soviet Union have brought "encouraging signs" in the realm of religion too. "No one had been imprisoned for his religious convictions over the last 2 years...new churches are being built and opened," he stated in particular. However, he added the caveat that "although we indeed welcome each positive step undertaken by the Soviets, we realize that this is still only a start."

The U.S. President complained of the fact that "the publication of religious material is banned" in the USSR, while in actual fact the publication of such material is being expanded. He expressed dissatisfaction too over the fact that there are no Sunday schools in the Soviet Union for instructing children in religion, but it is well known that in the United States, too, the insistent calls of the present administration for the introduction of compulsory prayers in schools are, to put it mildly, not being greeted with understanding, but rather are encountering steadfast resistance from the American public.

U.S. 'Misinformation' on Soviet Weapons Detailed

LD0505083088 Moscow World Service in English 0610 GMT 4 may 88

[Text] Unfortunately long distances and language barriers are not the only obstacles to a better mutual understanding. There are other things, too, and here are details from our observer, Mikhail Glebov:

The American paper LOS ANGELES TIMES published an interesting report the other day. It has emerged that the sensational picture of the latest strategic bomber B-2, which the Department of Defense released for the media, lacked accuracy. With reference to scientific sources, the paper said that the size of the cockpit is obviously bigger than it should be and the line of the front wings is incredibly straight. It would be wrong to think that a distorted picture like this is a rarity. There are a lot of such drawings in the new book of the United States Department of Defense called "Soviet Military Power." One of the pictures shows what is described as another alarming Soviet invention—the helicopter-cum-fighter plane. Indeed, the helicopter moving towards the viewer looks formidable. Yet, according to Tom Gervasi, an independent United States military expert, in reality the helicopter the way it is depicted is of little use as it is incapable of surviving an attack from fighting planes and, in a standoff with another helicopter, would amost certainly perish. The formidable shape can frighten only people unfamiliar with the laws of aerodynamics.

The book also contains a picture of a huge howitzer. As the caption claims, the howitzer is fresh evidence of the Soviet Union's growing artillery might and it can hit targets 30 km away. Yet again experts have concluded that the gun the way it is depicted won't have a range longer than 18 km. Explaining the distortions in the picture of the United States B-2 bomber, LOS ANGELES TIMES admitted that they were made deliberately to keep secret major data, but what can explain the lack of accuracy in the pictures of Soviet weapons in the Pentagon's book? Lack of knowledge? Of course not, since the booklet was prepared by military experts. In other words, this is another case of deliberate misinformation aimed at creating a misleading impression of the Soviet Union's fighting capabilities.

The purpose of such methods is to draw a distorted picture of Soviet policy in the region. For example, a number of local papers quoted United States official sources as claiming that the Soviet Navy in the Pacific is getting more active. But the foreign minister of Australia, William Hayden, discarded such assertions as false. In another case, Filipino papers carried reports about what was described as Soviet aid to the rebels. The reports were based on a statement ascribed to the speaker of the House of Representatives of the Filipino parliament, Mitra, who in turn had allegedly referred to a confidential report from the ambassador of the Philippines in Moscow. Yet all that talk was refuted by the

congressman himself, who said that the existence of such a report is a total fabrication revealing attempts to sow mistrust in the Soviet Union.

I have just listed some of the methods used to prepare misinformation.

China

PRC Stand on Nuclear Disarmament Endorsed

OW0505065488 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 26 Apr 88

[Alekseyev commentary from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev received Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to the Soviet Union, a few days ago. Rogachev briefed the ambassador on the results of the talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz that were held in Moscow recently. Alekseyev, an observer of this station, comments:

The main topics of the Shevardnadze-Shultz talks dealt with the Soviet and U.S. plan to cut offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent. Judging from remarks by Chinese leaders and comments in the Chinese press, China attaches great importance to the Soviet and U.S. plan. A few days ago RENMIN RIBAO said: Offensive strategic weapons pose the greatest danger to world peace. Therefore, drastic reduction in such weapons is an important task. This reduction will pave the way for complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet people completely agree with such views. We also agree with China's view that the Soviet Union and the United States have a special responsibility to reduce nuclear arms. As countries possessing the most nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union and the United States should set an example for others by making the first move in nuclear arms reduction. For this reason, the two countries, paying no attention to the attitude of other nuclear powers, have embarked on a road of drastically cutting their offensive strategic weapons.

How has this been going? In general, many helpful things have been done, although sharp differences still exist between the two countries. These differences have something to do with (?extending) the ABM Treaty and reducing the number of aircraft- and ship-carried cruise missiles. Topics at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow included not only drafting a treaty on offensive strategic weapons, but also very beneficial discussions on other issues, such as chemical weapons and bans on nuclear testing. The Soviet Union has long called for complete resolution of these problems.

We are happy that the Soviet Union and China actually have a common stand on these issues, which are very important to world peace. I also wish to point out that (?faith) in disarmament and world peace is part of the nature of socialism. The two most precious things, socialism and peace, are inseparable to the Soviet and Chinese people.

Culture Minister Meets With PRC Counterpart

LD0305131588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] An exchange of views began in Beijing today between USSR Culture Minister Zakharov, who has come to the PRC on an official visit, and Chinese Culture Minister Wang Meng. The sides acquainted one another with the progress of the profound transformations in culture which are under way in the USSR and in China. They discussed thoroughly and frankly [otkrovennyy] the problems arising along this road. In the conversation, both sides expressed an aspiration to develop Soviet-Chinese cultural links further.

Trade Union Leader Greets PRC Workers

OW0405021088 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Dear listeners, Makeyev, secretary of the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, extends his 1 May greetings to you all:

Dear friends, on behalf of 140 million trade union members in the Soviet Union, I extend my greetings to you all on the occasion of the 1 May International Labor Day.

The Soviet people pay close attention to the mission of the Chinese workers to accomplish, on their own account, the socialist modernization of the PRC. We are truly happy that much has been achieved in this aspect. Currently, economic and social reform in the Soviet Union and China requires the active participation of trade unions and mass organizations of workers to develop production forces and improve the relations of production through the most effective methods. In many aspects, the missions of our two countries are similar.

Soviet and Chinese trade unions began their contact not long ago. They have now become very active in this respect. They exchange mutual experiences on trade union activities, the working and living conditions of workers, and the achievements and difficulties encountered during socialist construction. The trade unions of our two countries also exchange union publications. The GONGREN RIBAO [WORKERS' DAILY] delegation has just ended its visit to the Soviet Union, and the Soviet trade union delegation is preparing to visit China. The year 1987 started to produce results after the restoration of trade union relations between our two countries. That year, we received the All-China Federation of Trade Unions delegation, led by President Zhang Fuyou. I had the honor to pay a return visit to China by leading

the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions delegation. We have also agreed to continue sending delegations to exchange working experience. In short, there has been notable progress on both sides.

We are two neighboring socialist countries with the largest trade union organizations in the world, and the potential for cooperation is tremendous. We propose that our ties with Chinese comrades be strengthened. We also propose cooperation and mutual assistance by workers of the two countries during the course of perfecting socialism, enhancing its international status and fighting for world peace and security.

This year, the Chinese trade unions will hold their 11th national conference of delegates. Preparation work has began, and it will be held under the guidelines of the resolution of the 13th CPC National Congress.

Chinese society has been flourishing, achieving much success during its socialist construction. We are very happy about that. Once again, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere wishes to the Chinese workers and to the great, hardworking, and talented people of China on the occasion of the 1 May, International Labor Day. Dear comrades and friends, we sincerely wish you successes in the sphere of labor, good health, happiness, a prosperous society, world peace, and a further strengthening of Soviet-Sino friendship.

Expansion of Sino-Ukrainian Relations Discussed

AU0405125588 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 21 Apr 88 p 3

[Report by V. Sednev, bureau chairman of the All-Union Association of Sinologists: "Sinology in the Ukraine"]

[Text] A constituent meeting of the Ukrainian branch of the All-Union Association of Sinologists, established under the Literature, Language, and Art Criticism Section of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, was held recently.

The republic-level public scientific organization associates in its ranks learned sinologists, public figures, teachers, translators, and mass media workers.

Sinology in the Ukraine has a long tradition. In recent years, it has developed appreciably, and scientific, production, and cultural relations between the Ukrainian SSR and the PRC are expanding.

The branch will help further promote sinology in the Ukraine, as well as the propaganda of the historical and cultural heritage of the Chinese people, and of the PRC successes in building socialism.

Food Price Subsidies Introduced in PRC Cities

PM0405100588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "China"]

[Text] Monthly subsidies of 10 yuan per person have been introduced in Shanghai, Hangzhou, Nanchang, and a number of other Chinese cities in connection with the significant growth in the price of pork, vegetables, eggs, and sugar. According to official figures, in the first quarter of this year the retail price index was up 11 percent in the country as a whole. Food prices have increased particularly strongly in large and medium-sized cities.

Reporting this, the local press has been discussing the experience of the city of Changsha, Hunan Province, which rejected the practice of "indirect subsidies," when they are received not by the citizens themselves but the food stores to "support low retail prices." Thus, the enterprises themselves now issue subsidies to the workers.

Northeast Asia

More on Japanese Communist Delegation in Moscow

Gorbachev Makes Arms Statement

OW0505010588 Tokyo KYODO in English 0019 GMT 4 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, May 4 KYODO—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said Wednesday that Moscow and Washington must make more efforts to reach an agreement to halve strategic nuclear weapons.

His statement was taken to indicate that there is no prospect in sight for the two superpowers to conclude negotiations over a strategic arms reduction treaty before his summit with U.S. President Ronald Reagan to start in Moscow on May 29.

Gorbachev made the statement in a meeting with a delegation from the Japan Communist Party [JCP] at the Soviet Communist Party headquarters here, a spokesman for the Japanese delegation said.

The Japanese delegation, led by Central Committee Vice Chairman Tetsuzo Fuwa, arrived Monday for talks with Soviet leaders.

The Gorbachev-Fuwa meeting was also attended by Anatoliy Dobrynin, head of the International Bureau of the Soviet Party, Mitsuhiro Kaneko, chief of the JCP Secretariat, and other officials of the two parties.

Gorbachev was quoted as saying Moscow and Washington need to make more efforts to solve inspection problems before reaching an agreement on the strategic arms reduction treaty.

He also said the two countries are still unable to agree on the issue of cruise missiles although they are going all-out to solve it.

The Japanese spokesman said Gorbachev and Fuwa agreed to raise public opinion worldwide for promotion of a peace and antinuclear campaigns.

After a 2-hour plenary meeting of the 2 parties, Gorbachev and Fuwa had their individual meeting to discuss the world situation in general and the situation in Asia and the Pacific in particular.

No details of the Gorbachev-Fuwa meeting were made public immediately.

Gorbachev Receives Fuwa

LD0405200088 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 4 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev met at the CPSU Central Committee today with Tetsuzo Fuwa, deputy chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan [CPJ].

Fuwa is heading a party delegation to talks in Moscow.

Gorbachev expressed on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee satisfaction with the regular ties that were established between the two parties.

Time compressed developments, imparted dynamism to them, which called for a vigorous character of relations between the communist parties.

Noting that a known negative period in relations between the Communist Party of Japan and the CPSU was left behind, Gorbachev expressed readiness to discuss in the spirit of goodwill and openness any problems with the use of the "capital of understanding" that had been accumulated ever since.

Major issues of international significance were discussed in the five-hour conversation. Greatest attention was given to problems of eliminating nuclear weapons and building a nuclear-free world.

Both sides stated that in the period since the previous meeting of the CPSU and the CPJ at the top level, the world had witnessed major changes, favourable on the whole for the solution of the historic task of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons.

The interlocutors highly assessed the diverse significance of the INF Treaty signed in Washington. Gorbachev voiced the opinion that the treaty would be ratified, that it was hard to imagine that someone would dare assume responsibility for its disruption in full view of the world.

At Fuwa's request, Gorbachev informed him about the course of talks on the 50-per cent reduction of strategic offensive weapons and prospects for reaching an agreement.

In discussing the question of difficulties involved, the Japanese comrades, taking into account the geographical situation of their country, drew special attention to the need for resolving the issue of sea-based nuclear weapons, of SLCMs.

It was stated that the process of talks on nuclear disarmament received a powerful impetus from the change in the public atmosphere with regard to nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war.

The programme of creating a nuclear-free world, set out by the Soviet leadership in January 1986, in defining the ultimate objective with time-tables for attaining it, provided the anti-nuclear movement with a clear perspective.

This goal fully met the principled concept of the Japanese Communists and sentiments of broad circles of the Japanese public who were consistently and persistently campaigning for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Obstacles along that path were analysed. They were substantial, and the situation should not be viewed as rose-coloured. Many people in the world had not as yet realised the entire danger of the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" which they were using to justify various plans of "compensation" and "modernisation", including in Japan.

Like the attempts to put weapons in outer space, this doctrine was leading to the acceleration of the arms race and enhancing the threat of nuclear war. It fed on the intentions to gain military superiority and reach commanding heights in world politics.

Importance was stressed of specific steps towards the ultimate objective, such as the consolidation of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, prevention of the deployment of nuclear weapons in other countries, creation of nuclear-free zones, limitation and termination of nuclear testing. It was worth while thinking about returning to the idea of moratorium, Gorbachev observed in this connection.

The sides considered issues of cooperation between the CPSU and the CPJ in the campaign for peace, participation of public forces in both countries in the anti-nuclear movement that was playing such an important part in present-day politics.

On behalf of the CPSU and the Soviet public, Gorbachev expressed solidarity with the campaign of collecting signatures under the Hiroshima and Nagasaki appeal, and announced the intention of Soviet public organisations to take an active part in the "second peace wave."

Mikhail Gorbachev and Tetsuzo Fuwa have expressed confidence that a nuclear-free world is attainable in conditions of recognition of the freedom of socio-political choice by every people, every country. The idea has been expressed that the 21st century will be for capitalism, as a social system, a real test of its ability to exist and develop in conditions of demilitarisation.

Special attention has been devoted to the problems of the Asia-Pacific region. The significance has been confirmed of the ideas and proposals expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech and in the interview with the newspaper MERDEKA. Ever more facts are being accumulated, which are evidence of the interest in these constructive initiatives on the part of many states of the region. The U.S. response to that was a build-up of pressure, its military presence there counter to the obvious tendencies in most of the states of the Asia-Pacific region towards businesslike cooperation, interaction and peaceful settlement of pressing problems, vital for every country and the region as a whole. Militaristic approach is in conflict with the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and the growing realisation among public and in many political circles there of the responsibility for the destiny of the whole world, especially in connection with the growing role of the Asia-Pacific region in the development of civilization.

A part of the meeting was held within the full delegation, and a larger part of it was an eye-to-eye meeting.

In conclusion of his meaningful and useful conversation, Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed the significance of the joint statement by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Japan in 1984, whose basic provisions of fundamental significance remain topical, albeit, it goes without saying, that a specific analysis of a concrete situation is necessary in their application. There are no few questions which deserve to be jointly discussed with the use, in particular, of the best scientific forces of both parties on a regular basis.

Mikhail Gorbachev requested that greetings and friendly wishes be conveyed to Kenji Miyamoto, chairman of the Communist Party of Japan Central Committee, the whole leadership of the Communist Party of Japan. He also expressed preparedness for new meetings, for developing relations on the basis of equality, respect, mutual non-interference, including on questions of phrasing the stands on some or other issues.

Taking part in the meeting were Anatoliy Dobrynin, Georgiy Korniyenko, Mitsuhiro Kaneko, Hiroshi Tachtiko, Hiroshi Kikunami, Seji Niihara and H. Nisiguchi.

Dobrynin Welcomes Japanese Socialists

LD0405142588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1346 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 4 May (TASS)—A delegation of leading employees of the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) led by Takako Doi, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee, arrived here today at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

At the airport the delegation was met by Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and by senior employees of the CPSU Central Committee.

The welcoming party included Toshiaki Muto, Japan's ambassador to the USSR.

Japan 'Firmly Seated' in U.S. 'War Chariot'

OW0505121388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 27 Apr 88

[Mulatov commentary]

[Text] Thirty-six years ago, on 28 April 1952, the Japanese-U.S. security treaty became effective. In this connection, Mulatov, a station observer, writes:

As World War II came to an end and Japan surrendered, the United States adopted a policy of turning Japan into its military strategic base area in the Far East. For this purpose, the United States and Japan signed the so-called security treaty in September 1951. It was revised in 1966 but is still effective today.

Recently, Japan has become more firmly seated in the U.S. war chariot and more firmly committed to helping the United States carry out its militaristic plans in the Far East and the Pacific region. Going along with Washington, Tokyo has increased its military expenses year after year. The Takeshita administration has appropriated huge funds to carry out various military programs.

According to the Japanese paper YOMIURI SHIMBUN, Japan's naval command is secretly planning to get aircraft carriers. The Japanese armed forces have been continuously improving in terms of quality, while expanding cooperation and coordination with the U.S. Armed Forces in the Asia-Pacific region step by step.

To achieve its objectives in global aggression, the U.S. ruling clique has been bringing Japan's special role into full play by turning it into a forward base for U.S. nuclear weapons. More than 120 U.S. military bases and facilities are located in Japan, and nearly 50,000 U.S. soldiers are stationed there. The U.S. naval bases in Yokosuka and Sasebo have become home bases for U.S. submarines active in the Northwest Pacific. Nuclear missile-carrying submarines often enter these harbors. Warships of the U.S. 7th Fleet are armed with sea-based Tomahawk cruise missiles capable of long-range nuclear strikes. These warships often sail into Japanese harbors.

Washington supplements its sea-based nuclear weapons with air-based ones. For this purpose, the United States has deployed at Misawa Airbase F-16 fighter-bombers with a flying radius of 1,000 km and capable of carrying

nuclear weapons. Many of the U.S. military bases in Japan have been continously expanded and remodeled. All this clearly proves to people that the U.S.-Japanese security treaty is becoming an ever growing threat to countries and people in the Far East and the Pacific region.

One fact which is making Asians more vigilant is that in Japan those forces that are striving to revive the great Japanese empire are becoming increasingly active. In Asia, as in other regions, the road to peace is not through confrontation or by aggravating tension. It is through the efforts of all Asian nations to help guarantee security in Asia and the Pacific and through the cooperation of all countries on a peaceful, equal, and mutual benefit basis.

DPRK's Kim Yong-nam Continues Soviet Visit

Received by Gorbachev

PM0505112188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under headline "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met on 4 May with Kim Yong-nam, member of the Korean Workers' Party [WPK] Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the Administrative Council, and DPRK foreign minister, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, took part in the conversation.

Kim Yong-nam presented Comrade Gorbachev with a personal message from Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK, and wished the Soviet people success in implementing restructuring.

The Korean side highly appraised the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the persistent efforts of the USSR directed at averting nuclear war and improving the international climate.

The Soviet position on Afghanistan has been an example of a constructive approach to settling crisis situations. Some easing of tension is also creating the prerequisites for resolving pressing problems in Asia. The DPRK is striving to eliminate the military threat in the Korean peninsula and to achieve the peaceful and democratic unification of the country. A condition for this is the withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear arms from South Korea.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev confirmed the interest of the Soviet side in ensuring peace and security in the Korean peninsula. The Soviet Union will continue to support the DPRK's course, which is directed at easing tension in the peninsula and at creating prerequisites for a political solution of the problems that exist there. This would be a major contribution to improving the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and fully accords with the ideas for detente that were expounded in Vladivostok.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee conveyed to Kim Il-song and the fraternal Korean people friendly greetings and wishes for success in the construction of socialism.

The meeting took place in a warm and comradely atmosphere. It was attended by G.G. Bartoshevich, Soviet ambassador to the DPRK, and Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR.

Ends Talks With Shevardnadze

LD0405165488 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Kim Yong-nam, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, deputy premier of the Administration Council and foreign minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, in the USSR on an official friendly visit, ended their talks today.

Stressing the fruitful character of the thorough exchange of views, the ministers came out in favour of strengthening cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK in the field of foreign policy and broadening Soviet-Korean consultations on current international problems, including issues relating to the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and in the Korean peninsula.

A joint statement for the press has been agreed upon.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Incursion Into Lebanon Condemned

Foreign Ministry Statement

LD0405180288 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Asked by a TASS correspondent, a spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry has made the following statement today:

The Israeli Army has launched a large-scale aggressive operation in Lebanon under the pretext of combating "terrorists". More than 2,000 soldiers supported by the Air Force, tanks and artillery are taking part in the invasion of the Lebanese territory. As during the actions of this kind in the past, the Israeli attack brings death and suffering to the peaceful Lebanese population, to the Palestinians, who found shelter in Lebanon's territory.

It is alarming that this big demonstration of military force was launched in close proximity to the territory of Syria, another sovereign Arab state.

The Soviet Union declares in support of Lebanon's territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence, demands unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the whole of that country's territory in conformity with the known U.N. Security Council resolutions, above all Resolutions 425 and 509. As far as the Palestinian people is concerned, the latter's right of self-determination shall be recognized and be realized to the measure security is insured for the people of Israel.

The Soviet Union strongly condemns Israel's criminal action in Lebanon and demands an immediate end to it. Tel Aviv should have long awakened to the truth that it will find neither peace nor security for itself on the path of armed provocations. The situation in the Middle East urgently necessitates an all-embracing political settlement through the convocation of an international conference, which is favoured by practically the whole international community.

U.S. Support Implied

LD0405210788 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Asked by a TASS correspondent, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry made today the following statement:

The Israeli authorities have continued their punitive operations against the mass actions by the Arab population of the Israeli occupied territories for many months now. Two weeks ago the Israeli secret services engineered the assassination in Tunis of Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], a prominent Palestinian figure. Now the Israeli Army launched a large-scale aggressive operation in Lebanon under the pretext of combating "terrorists". More than 2,000 Israeli soldiers supported by the airforce, tanks and artillery are participating in the invasion of Lebanon's territory. In common with the preceding actions of this kind, the current Israeli attack brings death and sufferings to the peaceful Lebanese population, the Palestinians, who found shelter in Lebanon's territory.

It is alarming that this big demonstration of military strength is being undertaken in close proximity to the territory of Syria, another sovereign Arab state.

It is symptomatic that the fresh aggressive actions, which are a breach of the norms of international law, have coincided in time with the 40th anniversary of the State of Israel. In celebrating this anniversary in such a strange way, the Israeli leaders should realise that the policy of violence sows the seeds of enmity, poisons the Middle East atmosphere.

Forty years is the age of maturity presupposing responsibility and a well-weighed approach to all questions, including to one's own country's security. It can be ensured only by equally respecting the right of the neighbours to independent safe development without interference from the outside.

The Soviet Union resolutely declares in support of Lebanon's territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence, demands unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the whole of Lebanon's territory in accordance with the known U.N. Security Council resolutions, above all Resolutions 425 and 509. As far as the Palestinian people is concerned, their right to self-determination shall be recognized and realised to the same measure as it is ensured for the people of israel.

Also noteworthy is another "coincidence"—the Israeli military have launched a fresh adventure following the signing of the so-called "Memorandum of Understanding", which is proof of the relations of alliance with Washington, i.e., as they say, securing for themselves in advance their own rear.

The Soviet Union strongly condemns Israel's criminal action in Lebanon and demands an immediate end to it. Tel Aviv should have long woken up to the truth that it will find neither peace nor security on the path of armed conflicts. The Middle East situation persistently dictates the need for an all-embracing political settlement through the convocation of an international conference, which is advocated by practically the whole international community.

'Veritable War' by Israel

LD0405170088 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—TASS news analyst Yevgeniy Babenko writes:

The invasion of South Lebanon by Israeli Armed Forces could be described from its very first hours as a scopeful operation with punitive purposes. After 24 hours have passed, it has become clear that it is a veritable war. The situation is complicated by the fact that simultaneously with the Israeli invasion of the southern part of Lebanon, the situation in the Lebanese capital aggravated considerably. Mortars have been used during a new outbreak of hostilities between the Moslem and Christian sectors of the city. The exchange of fire started in the area which was tranquil for a considerable period of time—in the very centre of the city, near the old market.

A group of independent deputies of the Lebanese parliament issued a statement in which it warned that definite forces try to plunge the country into a state of anarchy and devastation. The concern of the members of parliament is understandable. It is also clear who it is that aggravates the situation.

The seizure by the Israeli army of more territories in Lebanon is a natural continuation of the policy conducted by Tel Aviv with regard to Lebanon, writes LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS.

The question of the undelayed settlement of the long-drawn out Arab-Israeli conflict comes to the fore again because of an extreme aggravation of the situation in the region. The stand of Arab countries deserves to be noted in this connection. The overwhelming majority of Arab countries approve of the idea of holding an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties involved in the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

This is precisely the idea for whose implementation the Soviet Union declares and which is part of the Soviet peace plan for the Middle East. Western Europe declares for the holding of an international peace conference. It is only the United States and Israel that do not support this idea.

It is held in the West that a sharp change of the stand of the two sides in the positive direction can hardly be expected in the election year.

Israel prefers the role of an aggressor. But this road can take the world to a critical point beyond which the developments would be unpredictable. The burst of shells in the south of Lebanon bespeaks precisely of this.

India's Menon Received by Ziaul Haq in Islamabad

LD0405091788 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Islamabad May 4 TASS—Kumar Padma Shivshankar Menon, secretary for external affairs of the Indian Foreign Ministry, has made a brief visit to Islamabad. He held talks with the leadership of the Pakistani Foreign Ministry and was also received by the country's President Mohammad Ziaul Haq.

Mr Menon stated at Islamabad airport that the principal aim of his visit was to discuss with the Pakistani side the situation taking shape in the region following the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

Evaluating the results of the talks, he pointed out that he gained a better understanding of Pakistan's aims.

Local press reports have it that various matters concerning relations between India and Pakistan were also discussed during the meetings.

East Europe

Moscow TV Notes, Comments on Polish Strikes

LD0405203388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1837 GMT 4 May 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] There is still a complex situation in Poland. This is the 8th day of a strike by workers from several shops at the Nowa Huta metallurgical combine near Krakow. Also on strike are some of the workers at the Gdansk shipyard and at the Wroclaw wagon-building works. They are demanding a considerable rise in wages in connection with the rise in the cost of living.

Solidarity figures have also appeared on the political scene: They are counting on making use of these events for their own interests.

These actions have started having an effect on the situation in the industry of the whole country. Every day the Nowa Huta combine fails to deliver goods to the value of $90 million. The situation at the enterprise may influence the regularity of production at other works producing small cars, washing machines, refrigerators, and televisions.

The demands put forward by the strikers at Nowa Huta are virtually impossible to fulfill. This was explained by Poland's Industry Minister Bilip, speaking on television.

If we were to raise wages for the working people on the scale of the whole country to the amount by those taking part in the strike demanded, an extra $6 billion would have to be paid out. That would lead to the shelves in the shops being completely emptied, said the minister. The problem must not be solved at one works alone. The interests of the whole economy must be considered.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo has issued a statement. It notes that the party leadership understands and shares citizens' concerns, and favors a decision together with the workforce on the arising contradictions and problems. This, however, must be accompanied by realism and a feeling of responsibility for the future of Poland.

Urban Describes Strikes

LD0305201788 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Warsaw April 3 TASS—Press spokesman of the Government of the Polish People's Republic Jerzy Urban said at a press-conference today that a part of the work collective of the metallurgical complex in Nowa Huta, a number of workers of the Gdansk shipyards and several hundred workers of the Wroclaw carriage works are on strike now.

"The strikes that are held now and that are sought to be organized do not threaten the socialist state as it has durable internal and external foundations", he said. "But strikes threaten the economic reform. They can put it off or undermine it. And the reform is our national opportunity to overcome the difficulties of life and economic stagnation".

"Political slogans that accompany strikes erode the policy of gradual development and consolidation of democracy. The involvement of adversaries of socialism in the strikes, the attempts to impart the political character to the strikes show that the development of liberties under socialism can be used to harm socialism. The heightening of tension, endless demands and the staging of strikes can only hamper the processes of democratization and reforms".

"What is taking place now is not the repetition of what happened in 1980", the government spokesman said. "The crisis phenomena were then accumulating as a result of the erroneous policy of the leadership, and a just protest of the working class against that policy, against various distortions of socialist practice and lack of reform then erupted. Now the strikes broke out at the very start of the process of transition to radical reforms, in a situation when there is no need to stop work in order to speak out loud and be heard. The strikes are groundless and harmful both from the political and economic viewpoints".

"There is only one similarity with the year 1980: Protests are sought to provoke and are masterminded in some cases by the same persons who almost destroyed the Polish economy by strikes in 1981. Western countries directly or indirectly supply them with funds so that they could lead a prosperous life in Poland, and are guiding their actions. These persons declare outright in their publications that they want to cause a new crisis in Poland. As professionals who continue using the front of Solidarity, they can afford organize strikes since their material well-being does not depend either on the Polish economy, or on the functioning of workers, or on their own work", Jerzy Urban said.

Speaking on television, Poland's Minister of Industry Jerzy Bilip said that the demands for wage increases advanced by the strikers of the Nowa Huta complex cannot be met and that they contradict the second stage of the economic reform. It should not be allowed that problems of one plant alone be decided. The interests of the whole of economy should be considered. The disruption of the reform is out of the question. The government is determined to ensure that the second stage of the reform be implemented in a normal way and reach the envisaged results.

Western Media 'Distort' Events in Poland

LD0405220188 Moscow International Service in Polish 1400 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] The issue of Poland has again become the leading subject of Western broadcasting stations. The news is edited in such a manner as to blow the extent of events out of proportion and distort the dimensions of the real state of affairs. RFE [Radio Free Europe] and Voice of America are disseminating all over the world Walesa's words about a possibility of a bloody revolution, and the BBC is advertising even more radical groups than was Solidarity. A coordinated campaign of Western broadcasting stations is aimed at painting a picture of Poland as a country on the verge of an outbreak of (?fire). This picture, however, is not an aim in itself. The most important thing is the attempt to program the course of events. Marking out the directions, or even suggesting tactics, is strategic. All this is nothing but an interference into internal affairs of a sovereign country, and another attempt to destabilize the situation in Poland and to prevent indispensable reforms.

Undoubtedly, there is no shortage of problems in Poland, for if there were no problems, why would reforms be needed? The actions of Western propaganda centers are aggravating the situation, making it difficult to implement sensible decisions. The campaign is being conducted according to all the principles of the art of subversion, and even accompanied by the broad American smile. This is what Charles Redman, U.S. State Department spokesman, is saying to journalists now: The United States is conducting a long-existing policy of supporting the flourishing and freedom of the Polish nation. Does this mean the economic sanctions, which are still in force, and the new propaganda war against Poland also support the flourishing of the Polish nation?

Charles Redman can only be understood when one remembers the old proverb: The tongue serves a diplomat to conceal his real intentions.

Radio, Solidarity Fuel Unrest

PM0405152988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Starukhin dispatch under the general heading: "In Whose Interests?"]

[Text] Warsaw, 3 May—In connection with the labor conflicts in Poland it should be remembered that the prices of foodstuffs and practically all consumer goods in Poland were raised in February and March of this year on the basis of the radical economic reform being implemented in the country. That enforced measure was taken for the purpose of bringing the product's final cost into line with the actual cost of producing it.

In one of the large cities—the voivodship center of Bydgoszcz—buses and streetcars came to a halt 25 April. Public transport workers issued an ultimatum, having deliberately warned neither the city authorities nor their own leadership of their intention, thereby putting other labor collectives in a complex position. The original reason for the strike was, in particular, an increase in the wages of internal city transport workers in Warsaw. But can there be automatism here? It is no coincidence that

the principles of the reform today give local managements the right to regulate the size of basic pay and bonus payments depending on the level of an enterprise's profitability and the size of profits.

Analogous actions took place in certain other cities in the country. Western anti-Polish centers and the internal opposition at once decided to take advantage of this. Here is what TRYBUNA LUDU wrote: "The question is not new. For several years now the ranks of 'real friends' of the working class cause have become active in the middle of April or a little earlier. They would like to celebrate the May Day festivals, when people demonstrate proletarian class unity, in a different way—by destroying this unity." Western radio stations have not slept, literally and figuratively, during these days, and the air has been filled with appeals to people to develop the scale of the protest, step up demands, and stand their ground to the end, as the saying goes. The self-styled leaders of the former "Solidarity" have crawled out into the light, and Lech Walesa's voice has been heard time and again telling Western correspondents that "the situation is becoming increasingly heated."

Prices have been raised in the country in order, as far as possible, to balance the mass of commodities with the money in circulation. The least step back at the present time, Polish economists point out, is a blow to the reform and to the plans and calculations for economic improvement tomorrow. The backstage inspirers of the strikes have been putting their trust in this extremely complex economic situation. However, they considered these pre-May incidents at enterprises only a "rehearsal," while the chief design was aimed at the working people's May Day demonstrations, to which it was planned to impart quite the opposite nature.

In Warsaw and other Polish cities the May Day festivities passed off as usual. Forces unfriendly toward socialist Poland failed in their intention of spoiling the festival. The sadly well-known "Solidarity" has already tried to play on the Poles' feelings. Everyone knows what came of this.

'Unprecedented Propaganda'

LD0405211188 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1937 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Warsaw, 4 May (TASS)—In a situation in which the world is striving for disarmament, certain forces in the West, which continue to want to pursue a policy from a position of strength and to build up the arms race, are attempting to turn Poland into an instrument for wrecking positive processes in international relations. This is stated by the Polish agency PAP in a comment on the unprecedented propaganda fuss mounted by the Western news media in connection with the latest events in Poland and the way they are heating up the atmosphere surrounding the strikes.

The striking metallurgists and shipyard workers do not know of these cynical purposes, but unquestionably the organizers of the strikes are well aware whose interests they serve. Their aim is to block the processes of democratization, economic reforms, renewal, and restructuring which have begun and are undergoing development in the socialist countries, something which worries the forces of reaction in the West and also the opponents of renewal and reforms in Poland.

Their traditional goal, which they want to attain at any price, is to bring about clashes and conflict in Poland. While hypocritically calling for an improvement in living standards and accelerated economic development, they are at the same time disorganizing production and violating public order. This activity does not accord with the interests of Poles, the majority of whom have managed to get to the bottom of this political game, PAP states.

In connection with incidents where threats and violence have been used at the Nowa Huta combine and the Gdansk shipyard by the extremist initiators of the strikes against working people trying to work normally, Polish Government press spokesman J. Urban declared: We shall not allow an atmosphere of anarchy to be created and relations between people to be exacerbated. Both strikes are degenerating and threaten serious consequences. We call for an end to both strikes, he stressed.

Bilip Describes Strikes' Effect on Industry

PM0505095588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 88 Morning Edition p4

[Undated Warsaw dispatch by own correspondent L. Toporkov under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Combine Suffering Losses"]

[Text] J. Bilip, Polish minister of industry, spoke on a television news program yesterday. He said that the continuing strike in a number of shops at the Nowa Huta metallurgical combine will have unpredictable consequences. I cannot fail to be concerned by the situation, the minister said, as it is having a negative impact on all industry and, I may say, on the entire Polish economy. After all, the combine supplies metal to a very large number of enterprises. The "Polkolor" television plant is having difficulties, for example. This enterprise is now being forced to spend hard currency on metal.

Continued inactivity by the combine—and this has continued for some 10 days already—will result in large losses: Every day the country is not being supplied with tens and hundreds of passenger vehicles, buses, washing machines, refrigerators, television sets, and other products. The losses incurred by the metallurgical workers themselves are also considerable. It has been calculated that since the beginning of the strike the combine has lost more than 3 billion zlotys as a result of not selling anything. This means it has lost 300,000,000 zlotys in

profit, which could have been used to remunerate people for work. Alas, no work has been done. Every new day wasted only complicates the situation, including the financial situation.

Like other enterprises in Poland, the metallurgical combine is working under new economic management conditions, when its prosperity depends wholly on organized work by the collective and on profit. Raising wages which have not been earned but, I again repeat, have been extorted through blackmail can only be done by depriving others.

This bad example has proved infectious, as another group of some 150 people tried to organize a strike at the Gdansk shipyard. They picketed the gates and began a rowdy meeting at which an inflammatory speech was given by L. Walesa, who is on sick leave. Having made the speech, he went home to watch the development of events from a distance. However, the calls for a strike have been unsuccessful here. Attempts to provoke riots have also failed to find support at the "Dolmel" Combine in Wroclaw.

Speaking in Warsaw on 1 May, W. Jaruzelski said that demagogues and all kinds of rowdies who are supposedly suffering for the people are playing on the difficulties still present in Poles' everyday life. The May Day demonstrations held throughout Poland have shown that the lessons learned by the country in 1981 have not been in vain and have warned people against adventurism and irresponsibility.

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Contras Reject Aid Via Red Cross

PM0305134988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 88 Second Edition p4

[TASS report: "Difficult Talks"]

[Text] Managua, 30 Apr—At the talks being held here with the Nicaraguan Government, the leadership of the armed counterrevolution categorically rejected the authorities' proposal to extend the temporary truce until 30 June. The contras also refused to receive humanitarian aid through representatives of the International Red Cross, insisting that aid continue to be sent via the U.S. Agency for International Development, which, as is well known, has close links with the CIA.

Nonetheless, at the Friday session, agreement was reached during the talks on drawing up a final document on the results of the meeting and the final cease-fire. The Nicaraguan Government proposed examining together all questions linked with ending the war, including humanitarian aid to the contras, the deployment of contra groupings in cease-fire zones, and their transition to peaceful life.

Oil Pipeline Construction Contract With Cuba

LD0305203888 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Havana April 3 TASS—A contract on the construction of the first pipeline "Friendship" in Cuba with Soviet technical assistance was signed here. The pipeline some 200 kilometres long will link the pier for the handling of supertankers under the construction in Matanzas Province with a refinery in Cienfuegos. Both projects are under construction with Soviet assistance.

The pipeline "Friendship" under construction in Cuba is the first such project on the Island of Freedom. But the importance of the contract is determined not by this alone. The construction of the pipeline is a sign of the Soviet Union's new approach to the development of economic cooperation with Cuba. It is the first time in the practice of ties between the two countries over many years that an economic project will be built with Soviet technical assistance under a contract. The first Soviet building organization is being set up here for the purpose. Some 400 specialists will work there. Cuban engineers, technicians and workers will work shoulder-to-shoulder with them to build the "Friendship" pipeline which is to go into operation in two years.

A new stage in the development of one of the branches of the transport economy of Cuba will start with its coming (?into) operation. A network of oil pipelines is to link with the passage of time the deposits in Baradero and Boca de Jaruco with the base for large-tonnage tankers in the port of Matanzas and with large oil refineries in Havana, Cienfuegos and other cities.

The conclusion of the contract opens a new page in cooperation between the two countries, TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev was told by chief of the board of Cuba's State Committee for Economic Cooperation, Jose Rosado Amador. "From now on we can speak of expanded technical assistance by the USSR, since Soviet building organizations will be operating in Cuba", he said.

Commercial Bureau Head on Brazilian Trade Ties

PY030121 Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO in Portuguese 2 May 88 p 14

[Interview with new Soviet Commercial Bureau head Valeriy Voinov by O GLOBO correspondent Carlos Tavares de Oliveira in Rio de Janeiro; date not given]

[Text] Oliveira: What effect does "perestroyka" have on Soviet foreign trade?

Voinov: I will try my best to touch upon the most important points. It is difficult in a brief interview to talk about all aspects of the reform being introduced in the area of foreign trade relations in the Soviet Union. Reform in this area, as with "perestroyka" in general, comtemplates a medium- and long-term process of

renewal of society. This process is intended to shape socialism in the most up-to-date form, in line with the demands of the technological and scientific revolution and the intellectual progress of Soviet society. This is a necessary reform; it is a reform that our reality demands.

Oliveira: What, then, are the changes made by "perestroyka"?

Voinov: A fundamental reform in the structure of foreign trade has recently been made. Taking the old Foreign Trade Ministry and the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations as a basis, a new Economic Foreign Relations Ministry was created. It will henceforth coordinate national policy in this area. The ministerial structure was simplified, personnel were reduced, and things that were superfluous were eliminated.

Oliveira: How did the reform affect the Soviet Union's foreign economic relations?

Voinov: The decree-law approved in January 1987 providing for the creation of mixed enterprises, with the participation of Soviet entities and enterprises from capitalist countries or developing countries in the Soviet Union, elicited great interest among all types of foreign enterprises. This new legislation aims at promoting, in stable and mutually advantageous conditions, cooperation of an economic, commercial, technological, and scientific nature.

Oliveira: How will that restructuring affect Brazilian-Soviet trade?

Voinov: Last year, Soviet-Brazilian trade amounted to nearly $500 million (68 billion cruzados). The Soviet Union exported goods worth $75 million (10.2 billion cruzados), while Brazil exported goods worth $425 million (55.6 billion cruzados). I believe that this very low volume of trade does not represent the true potential of our economies, because the share or participation of each country in the trade volume of the other is less than 1 percent.

Oliveira: How could we invigorate our trade? What would be the form and methods to develop our cooperation?

Voinov: The answer can be found in the agreement for economic, commercial, scientific, and technological cooperation signed between the Soviet Union and Brazil on 30 September 1987. This agreement provides for a broad utilization of new and traditional forms of cooperation. It makes possible the creation of mixed enterprises in each country, as well as industrial integration, joint participation in large industrial projects in third countries, advanced scientific cooperation, and sale of licenses, patents, expertise, etc.

Oliveira: We know that two joint ventures are under way with the Cacique and Abrasucos companies of Sao Paulo. One is to sell vodka bottled in Brazil, and the other is to sell orange juice. This is being done under the new "perestroyka" legislation, which allows for 51 percent and 49 percent Soviet and Brazilian participation, respectively. Is there any possibility for similar association with enterprises of Rio de Janeiro?

Voinov: I can tell you that we are already negotiating with some enterprises in Rio de Janeiro concerning this issue. I want to take this opportunity to say that we are ready to examine proposals from Brazilian firms that might be interested in creating joint enterprises, either in the Soviet Union or Brazil.

Political & Social

Reaction to Revolutionary Thinking Article

PM0405161188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[O. Lunin "Review of Readers' Responses to the Editorial Article 'Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thinking and Acting'": "Renewal Is the Way Forward"]

[Text] The PRAVDA editorial article published on 5 April this year aroused tremendous interest among readers. It is almost 1 month since it was published. Approximately 1,000 letters and telegrams have been received. This flow, and in particular, the very content of the responses, irrefutably attest that the party's policy of restructuring is warmly supported by the people and that restructuring is increasingly deeply entering life, determining the nature of social awareness and of people's everyday practice. "Increasing social activeness and faith in the party's determination to see through to the end what has been begun are the chief result of the first 3 years," V. Germanchuk, senior lecturer in the CPSU History Department of the Leningrad Shipbuilding Institute, believes.

"During this short time, thanks to the people's support, the restructuring outlined by the party has assumed an all-embracing nature and has already had time to produce the first visible fruits: an unprecedented upsurge of the people's initiative, of working people's enterprise, and of their social responsibility for everything that is happening in the country; trust and respect for the individual are strengthening, and the discrepancy between word and deed is being overcome—which has not been slow to have a positive impact on the moral atmosphere in the country," Ukrainian writers who sent a collective letter to the editors believe.

Here is a letter from A. Kolganova, a resident of Rylsk in Kursk Oblast: "Dear Editors! The article 'Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thinking and Acting' shook me to the depths of my soul. I read it and, believe me, I wept. I wept for all who suffered so agonizingly during all those 'stagnation' years, as I did. I wept for those who suffered from injustice, helplessness, and the impossibility of upholding the truth. How much irony I heard from relatives and friends when I tried to convince them that the truth would conquer and justice would triumph! How it pained me to see my comrades at work who 'dug their heels in'! The long-awaited time has now arrived. Some people still try to doubt the need for restructuring?! Our Soviet people, our young people need it like they need air to breathe! There is no other way...."

V. Barsukov of Yegoryevsk in Moscow Oblast writes of the same continuing "unalarmed" stagnation in the consciousness and actions of certain people: "They unfortunately play a waiting game. Let us wait and see how things, turn out they say. As someone who has lived the greater part of my life, I could probably be forgiven for looking at things like this. But I cannot do so, because I realize that the cause of restructuring is the destiny of you and me, of all together and everyone individually."

What do readers who voice solidarity with the PRAVDA article write? Of what do they speak? (Incidentally, they make up three-quarters of all who shared their opinion). The leitmotiv of very many letters is this: to advance restructuring in every possible way. A departure from it and even its deferment are fraught with very serious consequences both for our society's internal development and for the Soviet state's international positions. We have secured this party policy through painful experience and will not abandon it. Of course, people have in mind, above all, what they have lived through, the past.

Yet, when they say "secured through painful experience," they have in mind not only the period of the personality cult. There are also the previous attempts to overcome its consequences without democratizing society, which is inconceivable, Engineer A. Sharov of Rudnyy in Kustanay Oblast is convinced. There is the voluntarism of recent years, whose consequences still hamper people's lives—Sochi resident V. Dotsenko experienced them in full measure. "I was expelled from the party on a wave of the hand by Medunov, first secretary of Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom, and then I was put in prison because I dared to tell the truth about violations of our laws.... Recently, when the raykom learned that I was being nominated for the party organization bureau, two agents at once came with documents prepared in the past by 'former' people and ensured that I was struck off the lists...."

Finally, "secured through painful experience" also applies (chiefly!) to the future, as we are convinced by a letter from I. Skrementov of Bryansk: "I worked for 34 years in one shop, the casting shop. I lived well (if I were not sick), and I am angry with no one. Whether restructuring triumphs or fails, it will have little effect on me personally. But it is terrible to think what will happen to my children and grandchildren if the old way gains the upper hand." "Your article has given us strength," Leningrad resident S. Butyrskaya writes. "We see that there is strong resistance to restructuring, and many of us are still suffering in the struggle for it, but our faith is strong that we will hold out and win despite everything."

We will hold out... But is the threat really so great? Some letter writers are perplexed: What did PRAVDA find of an "antirestructuring" nature in the article "I Cannot Waive Principles," published by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA? Even though a clear and unambiguous answer has already been given to these questions, readers also add their own judgments to it. Doctor of Economic Sciences P. Luzan of Smolensk: "This is a clear attempt, under the flag of defending the pioneers of socialism, to unite white and black: the people's heroic labor and the methods which hindered the greatest efficiency of that labor." Student M. Latypov of Moscow: "Anyone who tries once

again to slur over the shortcomings of the past and to hide the truth from the people (try as he might) is against restructuring.... Knowing the truth, we will be stronger, since we will not repeat mistakes. But if we just let everything drop, the enemies of restructuring will immediately take advantage of this." Candidate of Medical Sciences V. Solenov: "The inability to take a long-term view makes these people stick to the old way and put their trust in orders and shouting."

Of course, the article carried in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA does not actually contain the words "against restructuring": Such a stance would clearly arouse no sympathy. But there is fear of the new realities, fear tinted by once popular phraseology and diluted by emotions of conservatism. "More socialism," Muscovite B. Kossovich ("son of a Communist, grandson of Bolsheviks," as he describes himself) believes, "means more open hearts and healthy thoughts. It means analyzing and adjusting the precise course for the happiness and joy of people, and not to intimidate, to stifle positive inclinations, or to suppress innovation and initiative. We are not only able but obliged to revive the Leninist practice of the socialist society."

Just so: Restructuring does not distort socialism but purges it of everything that hinders it and revives the Leninist essence of socialism. "According to Lenin, socialism is impossible without democracy," V. Fedin remarks. "According to Stalin, it is possible.... But the latter 'model' of socialism inevitably leads to the working people's alienation from public ownership, on the one hand, and from political power on the other, and this path can lead to nothing but new irreplaceable losses and states of crisis."

Certain readers, like N. Petrov, a Muscovite not in the party, raise objections about the "merciless criticism" of Stalin's activity. However, the overwhelming majority of the readers who have sent in comments wholly share the assessments and the positions of the PRAVDA editorial article. "The style of running the country and the style of thinking associated with Stalin's name are still alive and are unreservedly bad today," A. Andreyev writes, in particular. "It is precisely the inertia of the administrative system created during Stalin's times that has given rise to a shadow economy. Modern Odilovs of various ranks and nationalities have grown up not 'in the field of exposures' but deep within the bureaucratic apparatus."

Other letter writers perceived the PRAVDA article as a manifestation of a lack of democratic values. "Lenin did not shut anyone up," I. Pozdnyakova of Khabarovsk reproaches the editors. "How does it happen," she is echoed by Engineer A. Golenkov of Moscow Oblast, "that, given glasnost and democracy, there is, nonetheless, a 'green light' for one viewpoint but a 'red light' for another one?" Ye. Yevseyev sent the editors a detailed treatise, even two, in defense of N. Andreyeva. He called the publication of the PRAVDA article and the responses to it a campaign which resembles, rather, a "massacre." A person has expressed her viewpoint, he says, but has been snubbed.

Yes, of course, the viewpoint in itself could be expressed. The diversity of thoughts, opinions, views, and suggestions is also a real sign of our social organism's renewal. The point is a different one: The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article reflected positions of dogmatic thinking and served as a kind of platform to unite conservative-minded people, including a certain section of the party, soviet, and economic aktiv. PRAVDA rightly evaluated it as the ideological platform or manifesto of antirestructuring forces.

"Now what? Must we expect practical conclusions...?" labor veteran V. Glebov fears. "Obviously, will a campaign be mounted against SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA?" The very way these questions were formulated reflected alarm characteristic of the past, of the period of absolute "like-mindedness" and fear.

Colonel Yu. Korablev, retired, expresses the wish that PRAVDA should "consistently maintain an equally clearly reasoned position in all its articles. PRAVDA's authority is very important and necessary in the struggle for the restoration of the historical truth and against attempts to slow down revolutionary restructuring, regardless of who is making these attempts." "Criticism is a medicine," RSFSR Honored Economist V. Klochek, CPSU member since 1940, adds, "and we take medicine in order to combat illness."

Let us recall how resolute Lenin was when he saw the danger to the cause of the revolution. Whether it was a question of the need for the Brest peace treaty or of the transition to the new economic policy (incidentally, in both cases he, too, was accused almost of betraying socialism), Lenin argued in a principled and vehement manner, upholding his convictions. Why, then, do some people now perceive a principled assessment of mistaken judgments as a violation of some ethical norms? Is it not because during the stagnation years we lost the art of arguing in a Leninist manner and got used to unctuous surrogates for democracy?

The question of whether restructuring should be or not be is no longer a subject for discussion. Both the party and the people have firmly stated: It shall be! There is no alternative to it. And we will allow no turning back. Yes, these are now stern, crucial times. The emancipation of the economic consciousness of the collective and the individual depends on how economic acountability [khozraschet] functions in the economy. Respect for the truth and the reality of people's power are becoming established in society. The concept of social justice is being filled with new substance.... But these processes are certainly not taking place triumphantly. Some letters voice annoyance at the fact that the most acute problems

are unresolved: the housing problem, the food problem, and so forth. They perceive this as a divergence between word and deed and even lay the blame for this on... restructuring.

Well, there is a discrepancy between word and deed. This is a serious problem, and the party says so most frankly. The discrepancy between word and deed is precisely one of the brakes on restructuring "designed" during the age of stagnation, V. Stepnov of Leningrad points out. Self-management is proclaimed, while in practice economic planners frequently ignore the rights of collectives. Officials praise restructuring in speeches, while their actions contain violations of the Law on the Enterprise, hindrances to the development of cooperatives, and resistance to staff cuts. "It is approximately 2 and 1/2 years since the decision to create intersector scientific and technical complexes was adopted, but there is still no economic mechanism for their work, and an experimental and experimental-production base has not been created," Academician B. Naumov, secretary of the USSR Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies Board, writes. "We speak, write, and criticize the proliferation of paperwork, but it still flourishes," A. Chernenko of Perm adds.

Why is this happening? Because some people have still not realized the whole perniciousness of boggy stagnation—with the ruthless clarity with which war participant N. Borisevich (Minsk) saw it: "Restructuring is no stroll. Our motherland is in danger and has fallen into a pit from which it must extricate itself. It is a matter of life and death, that's all." Others have realized this and taken fright: Previously, when they did not know this, they led a more tranquil life. Such people, V.I. Lenin believed, start to whimper, cry, lose composure, repeat any gossip, thrash out, and talk incoherently of "the system."

So what are we to do? Stop? Turn back? But let us turn to letters from those who have been taking refuge for 20 years in hostels, waiting their turn for an apartment: Will we find there any sympathy with the "cautious"? Let us ask the residents of Ulyanovsk, where, as I. Samoylov writes, they have managed to organize full supplies to dairy and vegetable stores by using local resources, whether they want to "squeeze" such initiative and enterprise. Finally, let us recall our own sense of shame and bitterness on comparing many of our goods with foreign, imported goods.... What else can really change the situation, if not radical economic reform? What else can give people back the lost feeling of being in charge, if not full, unadapted democracy?

But so many specific steps have already been taken to resolve the housing problem! These includes additional appropriation of resources for the construction of apartment blocks, introduction of the state reception system in the construction industry, measures to expand the housing cooperative system, removal of all manner of rusty fetters from individual housing construction, and installation of order in the allocation of apartments. Yet the work is still essentially only just beginning to stir....

What can be done to prevent any reversal of what has begun? Many people, notably M. Voronkov, A. Vnukov, and A. Volovikov, students at the Leningrad Technology Institute, the very one where Nina Andreyeva works, have pondered this question. This is the conclusion they came to: "This is the first time conservative forces have 'flexed their muscles' so openly. Do you know who is their best ally? Yes, we ourselves, our passivity and political naivete. Passivity born of fear that suddenly tomorrow glasnost and democratization again "will have the oxygen cut off."

One thing is true: The braking mechanism is not just someone else's ill will. There are brakes within each of us, too. This habit of stereotyping or relying on instructions 'from above' is a sign of timidity in the face of unknown phenomena or dependence. "Why restructure ourselves, smashing all that has been done; is it not better to correct the course of our life in society? What is the point of this frightening word—restructuring?" Leningrader V. Grebov frankly asks. Confused voices are also heard on specific new phenomena of the present day. For example, quite a few rights have been given to labor collective councils, but sometimes you hear people say: These councils we have are just for form's sake. But who is hindering the reelection process, the introduction of intelligent, energetic people there, or real work demands being made on them? "People bide their time, they are afraid..." writes A. Krivulya from Kharkov. "Clearly because rights presuppose responsibility. Assume responsibility; don't blame others. But the latter attitude is altogether convenient: I can't see any restructuring, they say."

Dependency is actually a chronic disease. People infected with it regard the social safeguards offered by our state as social gifts. But in society, as in nature, nothing ever comes out of nothing. Social safeguards only remain real when they are backed up by meaningful labor.

True, the following opinion held by N. Petrov from Kiev is a tenacious one: "If anyone needs restructuring, it is leaders at all levels: Most workers work well." Is this true? Life has shown that working well is not enough. Today you have to work intelligently. Have weavers who have overfulfilled the norm by 100 percent worked well or badly if what they produce then lies around in warehouses? Or shoemakers who obtain a bonus for their output, which people then avoid like the plague in the stores? Or lathe operators who have assiduously converted tonnes of "surplus" metal into filings? What is this— labor discipline or senseless mismanagement?

Democracy is not just glasnost. Democracy is active work on the part of the masses. When it is established as such, restructuring will be truly irreversible. Leningrader

A. Slobozhan grasped this as follows: "From the moment the article appeared in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA... I could not sleep at night, and so I wrote a protest letter. I rewrote it several times, emending it, but did not send it. People tried to dissuade me, and I let myself be dissuaded. The principle of "not poking your nose in" worked once again. I now feel ashamed. I want to fight for innovation and not wait for help 'from above.' Essentially, the society which we want will be very different from the one we are used to. And living in it requires people who are not afraid."

"We are very happy that healthy forces were preserved in our peasantry," a group of members of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences—A. Nikonov, I. Shatilov, N. Milashchenko, A. Kashtanov, and others—write to the editorial office. "New forms of economic management are being created, which provide amazing examples of successful working. The peasant is standing tall, becoming the master of his land, accepting science, and quickly increasing labor productivity many times over. This is true revolutionary restructuring."

Here is an extract from a telegram from Academician D. Likhachev, chairman of the board of the Soviet Culture Foundation. "The Soviet Culture Foundation is the creation of the public in the period of restructuring. Glasnost, democracy, and historical truth: These are the precepts on which our activity is based when developing complex programs for preserving our historical and cultural legacy and activating and democratizing today's cultural life. We fully support and approve the truly revolutionary restructuring which is being undertaken by the party and will do everything possible to ensure its victory." A letter saying roughly the same has been received from the journal YUNOST.

A typical tendency also reflected in responses already published is people's striving to direct the discussion into a constructive channel. The letters contain many reflections on how to strengthen restructuring and ensure its acceleration. "All institutions, all organizations, and all elected organs must be under the people's control!" A. Kolganova proposes. "Give incentives to cooperatives producing material assets and agricultural produce" (says V. Pilshchikov, Ruzskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast). "We must learn how to organize production from the capitalists, while retaining public ownership of the means of production" (V. Pilshchikov again). "Local soviets and their ispolkoms must look people in the face. This applies first and foremost to departments of social security, state insurance, and housing offices, where they often do not know how to talk to people." (N. Kozlov, Tyumen). "The 'pacemakers of restructuring' must be promoted to the front line more quickly. At the moment, its opponents still have a lot of power." (Yu. Zheleznov, Moscow). "Theft, speculation, and bribery cannot be combatted slowly—they must be eradicated implacably." (N. Suliyeva and A. Rustamov, Baku).

M. Babayev, director of a sovkhoz nursery trust, expresses some hackneyed, old ideas: "When I was a sovkhoz director, we produced 40-50 quintals of onions per hectare. But then 50 hectares were given under contract to 13 families on condition thay they produce 150 quintals per hectare each and distribute the above-plan crop among themselves. They achieved 500 quintals each. The prosecutor issued a warrant for my arrest. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee intervened in the case and revoked the prosecutor's warrant but the above-target onions were confiscated from people. Since then no one produces onions under contract, and the sovkhoz is again growing 40-50 quintals per hectare. Annual losses amount to R50,000-R100,000.... I have much work experience, and I think that if land is allocated to cooperative members to produce vegetables, cucurbits, grapes, beets, cotton, and other row crops, the yield will increase between four- and seven-fold that same year."

Here is what Leningrad worker V. Novikov writes: "The supreme problem is the work and life of primary party organizations. That is where the stagnation persists. For decades people learned passivity, lack of responsibility, and a 'self first' mentality.

"That is where our attention should be focused. If this mechanism works, restructuring will progress as it should. People are pinning many hopes on the 19th all-union party conference. Perhaps it will remove the fetters which have bound party organizations, even though there is a certain sense of dependence in these expectations. There are questions which we must resolve today, and we shall resolve them if we really want to and are not afraid of the 'left-wing' and 'right-wing' opponents of restructuring."

Confidence in the success of renewal is the main feature distinguishing those who think as we do. "I am a contemporary of the October Revolution, and a Communist for 35 years," A. Gaykovich from Kiev writes to the editorial office. "Your article gave me great help in examining many complex questions of restructuring and the history of our state and confirmed me in the belief that this hard life has not been in vain." On restructuring, A. Morozov from Kishinev writes: "Glory to those who march in its ranks. They are the majority. That is why they are bolsheviks."

Of course, we cannot name all the readers who sent in their responses to the article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action." But all the letters will be read carefully, and account will be taken of their opinions. Sincere thanks to all of you, comrades.

Equivocation on Newspaper Polemic Criticized

PM0405084588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 1

[P. Gutiontov "Topical Issues" article: "Principles and Opinions"]

[Text] Staffers from one of Moscow's scientific research institutes approached IZVESTIYA a few days ago—they came in and described an incident which had amazed them and had aroused their indignation. The chief of the party raykom's Propaganda Department addressed them in the context of the latest integrated political day; she announced that "restructuring, in her opinion is irreversible," she recalled PRAVDA's editorial article in this context, but went on to add: It must be borne in mind that matters are not all as straightforward as that. The article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA apparently also contained much that is correct, and a considered approach was required....

What is this, our visitors asked; is it the raykom's viewpoint? But if so, why not say bluntly toward precisely what we ought to adopt a "considered approach?" Precisely what in the article is "not so straightforward?" What precisely are the "correct elements" it contains? In order to obtain an answer, I called at the raykom in question, met the Propaganda Department chief, and passed on to her the audience's questions. This is her explanation:

First, she expressed just her own personal opinion in the course of the political day.

Second, we have become accustomed to always await edicts. It was no accident that all the newspapers "joined in the fray" only after PRAVDA's signal....

Third, in principle she also considers that the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is incorrect, but there are certain nuances, nevertheless.... Therefore, she had neither the desire nor the intention to attach any labels groundlessly.

Fourth, she has spoken in the past and intends to continue speaking exclusively as an ordinary citizen and not from a position backed by the raykom's unquestionable opinion.

Fifth, the department chief did not tell me which "nuances" in the "manifesto of antirestructuring forces" she considered correct—she no longer remembers....

You must agree, there is something attractive in the stance taken by someone who arrives to meet other people armed with her own opinions rather than with a viewpoint approved from above. How often have we seen and still see the reverse!... But let us calmly examine what it is that we have come across on this occasion.

First of all, when arriving at a subordinate party organization, the department chief was representing not herself but a political organ, she was using its mandate at the meeting. And if the "citizen's stance" is in conflict with the "raykom's unquestionable opinion," it might have been a much better indication of civic awareness had she not actually spoken on behalf of the raykom. If for no other purpose, then to at least not confuse people. Once you arrive somewhere and use lofty words to explain the party's policy to people, then there can only be one such policy. There cannot be as many such policies as there are members of the apparatus.

Let us recall the eagerness with which sleeves were rolled up after the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by all who perceived it as a signal of a return to the past. How much energy was displayed in discussions by those who approved this article. The article's supporters found methods to take these ideas to their audiences without distortions. But what is happening now?

"People did not altogether understand me correctly,"—this argument was also used by N.G. Kozhevnikova, chief of the Kuntsevskiy CPSU Raykom Propaganda Department. But what is the worth of propagandists and of this sort of propaganda if it can apparently be understood to mean the "diametric opposite?!" And especially on a question that is neither trivial nor personal, but the very question which caused such an implacable clash between two directly opposite viewpoints on the country's past, its present, and its future?

We are on the eve of the all-union party conference. Even more: The party conference is essentially already under way. Quite recently, the publication of the two aforementioned articles produced a watershed dividing those who advocate radical restructuring and those who would like to go no further than cosmetic repairs.

Life today is bringing each and every one of us face to face with the need to "stand up and be counted." And each and every one of us must realize and remember: When choosing for himself, he is also choosing for the country.

Readers Express Conference Fears, Proposals

PM0405141588 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 May 88 p 10

[Roundup of readers' letters under the rubric "Current Mailbag": "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference. More Democracy!"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The nearer the all-union party conference gets, the more letters we are receiving with proposals, assessments, and opinions for it linked with the restructuring process and glasnost. The PRAVDA article "Principles of Restructuring: The Revolutionary Nature of Thinking and Action," which reaffirmed yet again our resolve to combat all conservative forces impeding the current reforms and retarding social progress, indisputably gave this subject a new boost. The theme of the editorial mailbag is: Reliable guarantees must be provided for restructuring and democratic transformations.

On the eve of the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference, I would like to ask a question which, in my view, is extremely topical not only for intraparty life.

It is well known that any self-respecting enterprise has statutes or provisions, as well as instructions relating to the workers' jobs. As far as statutes are concerned, these exist in our party, but nobody has any instructions relating to their jobs. Everyone is guided by the demands of the statutes, and they are thought to be wholly adequate. Yet this state of affairs creates the prerequisites for all kinds of abuses.

It is my profound conviction—and I have found confirmation of this in many of Lenin's works—that the party is the leading public organization that bases its work on collective foundations. That is why all decisions should only be made by the party's collective leading organ. And the responsibility for their fulfillment should be taken by this collective organ rather than by a single first secretary, as is the case at present.

Things have gotten ridiculous (and this continues to be the case at all party levels)! At sessions of a higher party organ—the bureau of our Maritime CPSU Kraykom on the subject of "The Work of Enterprise Party Committees....", for instance—the proceedings were attended and reports delivered by just one enterprise party committee secretary. He takes the rap [poluchayet shishki] for the entire party committee. And there is just one brain trying to rectify a sometimes very difficult situation. The collective party organ—in this case the enterprise party committee—is left on the sidelines. Or here is another example: On returning from a CPSU gorkom bureau session to examine the question of the allocation of people for the countryside (which in itself is blasphemous for the party), the first secretary of a CPSU raykom quickly assembles enterprise leaders and party committee secretaries and simply...orders them to carry out the decision. For some reason he has no time to put it to the collective organ—the party committee. If you allow yourself to disagree with the first secretary, you are immediately reminded of your personal responsibility to the party. The downright abuses of willfully appropriated power are nothing short of absurd!

We cannot go on this way if we want to seriously restructure our economic and social life. That is why I propose that the forthcoming party conference discuss the question of the status of party organs, the elective party aktiv, and party aktiv workers who have been relieved of their duties.

If this principled question is not resolved by the conference, I (and all the Communists I consulted before writing this letter agree with me) will think that this state of affairs is to somebody's advantage, and there can be no confidence in restructuring since overall policy in the country will once again start to depend on the personality of the general secretary of the Central Committee or secretaries of certain party organizations.

M. Robkanov, deputy to the city soviet and chief of the maritime trading port. Vladivostok.

I think that many people are now expecting the forthcoming party conference to make decisions which will make it possible to realize more quickly the hopes and expectations that have appeared in society over the last couple of years, as the "Gordian knots" discovered in our life are getting bigger not by the day but by the hour. Newspaper and magazine articles confirm this....

Anyone who wants to say something new or urgent should be allowed to speak at the conference. Perhaps an official commission will have to be set up to work out a final document which would take account of as many opinions and proposals as possible.

Here is another issue for discussion. The press is brimming with reports about the wrong position of certain party workers. After long investigations they receive some punishment or other. How much skilled labor and time is spent on these matters! Such situations could be simplified by introducing case law for party workers. Suppose it is established that a raykom secretary or a gorkom department chief victimized people for having been critical or interfered in the course of justice. There need be no investigations or explanations. This clear contravention of democracy could only mean expulsion from the CPSU. Or, for instance, selfish abuses would immediately mean dismissal and a bar on holding administrative office.... Hope for a "lifebelt" from above would diminish, and there would also be fewer people there to throw one. Should not the party resolve questions about its members in summary fashion?...

G. Goryunov, Volgograd.

I consider the most important problem of all to be the lack of guarantees of democracy. It is now clear to everyone that our losses in the economy and ideology were mainly a result of the personality cult, voluntarism, and stagnation—that is, the deformation of socialist principles started from above rather than from below. It is also clear that democracy and glasnost in society cannot and should not be determined merely by the personal qualities of the general secretary, and that talk about democracy will remain a fiction given the existing concentration of power.

The second problem is the effectiveness of democracy. Public opinion should not beat against our ministries and departments like water against a wall; voters not only in Moscow but locally should be able to obtain satisfaction from those they elect.

The third problem was formulated by V.I. Lenin in roughly the following way: Any reforms are necessary but secondary, everyday work; discussions about them are a political waste of time; cadre selection and verification of execution is the key to solving any problem.

May I be so bold as to claim that the execution of many government decisions is blocked in the highest spheres of administration, or the fundamental essence of the decisions is emasculated by them....

Without a radical solution of the above political and administrative problems there will be no firm confidence that restructuring represents unity of word and deed or that restructuring is in earnest and will be around for a long time.

I. Benevolenskiy, driver. Omsk.

A businesslike discussion of the fundamental problems of our life is possible only in conditions of democracy and glasnost. Who finds this unsuitable, who is in opposition to the current changes? The leader of any enterprise, institution, or institute. What makes me draw this conclusion? You have to agree that the existence of rigid discipline in production is an absolute necessity. In capitalist conditions everything is easily resolved: If you don't work, goodbye. Matters are different here. It is extremely complex to fire or even transfer an incapable worker. This is because we have trade union committees, party bureaus, and now even certification commissions. These organs bear collective responsibility for the placement of cadres and production indicators. But a director is personally responsible for the work of the institution he heads, and nobody will allow him to shift the blame onto the aforementioned organs. Consequently, and in order to be master of the situation, the director strives to staff these organs with obedient people. It goes without saying that in these conditions there can be no talk about democracy and glasnost, about the determining influence of public opinion.

But this is no reason for pessimism. As economic accountability and self-financing are being introduced, voluntarism and personal likes and dislikes are giving way to the ruble's diktat. But what happens when the introduction of real economic accountability is impossible, as for example in secondary and higher education, in some medical and scientific institutions, in ministries and departments? The question is left hanging in the air.

The system of party supervision, or rather centralized anarchy, has played a far from insignificant role in our country's economic regression. One thing is clear: Party organs must be freed from the performance of functions outside their province. In my view, party committees in the conditions of restructuring must, in addition to organizational-political activity, be more scrupulous in monitoring the observance of legality by taking on additional control functions.

Engineer V. Mamedov, Baku

Now, in the period of glasnost, your newspaper and other periodicals often write about the past. About the negative phenomena through which our country lived. It is all true, I can testify to that. I have a good knowledge of Stalin's, Khrushchev's, and other people's times. Much has been written by both academics and ordinary mortals like me. But strive as I may, I have yet to come across an instance of someone ever raising the question: What is the cause which gave rise to these mistakes and excesses? There we are, saying: The reason is to ensure that there is no recurrence. But you must agree that a disease must be diagnosed before it can be cured. But we don't want to know about the diagnosis. A bit of talking, writing, and reading—and everything will sort itself out. No, it won't. We have already experienced this in the late fifties. That was another period when we talked, we wrote, and we read—and what was the result? Voluntarism and the so-called "stagnation period" for decades. Where is the guarantee that this, or maybe something worse, will not happen again? Glasnost? But we already had both glasnost and democracy in the early Khrushchev years, and you know what happened later.

It seems to me that, in order not to return to the mistakes and excesses, we must know their cause, the source whence they draw their strength. And this cause can be seen with the naked eye. Primarily: Party and state leaders are beyond criticism. Absence of criticism coupled with hypocrisy and toadying by those around them spawn total permissiveness. And something else: It is necessary to put a limit on the tenure of a given position. For example, elect the general secretary for no more than two terms, as is currently the case in Bulgaria, as I understand it.

I do not think that you will publish my letter, I have evidently overstepped glasnost somewhat, but at least you will know that the working class is worried about its country's future.

Mine tunneler N. Kononenko, Shakhan Settlement, Karaganda Oblast

I take it upon myself to assert that many of our shortcomings were caused by the imperfect structure of the country's party organization, which enabled a mass of renegades and careerists to join the party ranks and use it as a cover to perpetrate their acts and continue to do so to this day. And yet they were all appointed by conferences, plenums, congresses. Where did their indifference, cowardice, ingratiation, toadying, sycophancy come from?...

Despite the fact that the cult was condemned at the 20th party congress, it nevertheless contrived to transform itself from the personality cult into an equally misshapen form—the cult of the leader.... No matter where you look, no matter what party organization you look at, everywhere you will come across the imposition of the leader's opinion on the entire collective. This practice undermines people's faith in justice, reinforces the bosses' faith in their own infallibility, and revives monstrous egocentrism. How tenacious all of this is!

Yu. Velchinskiy, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy

There are differences in glasnost when we speak about the distant past and the present. For some reason, when we talk about shortcomings in our time, we almost never hear the names of those who are to blame for people's misfortunes. Instead of their names, we use pronouns, as if these people have neither surnames, nor titles, nor official positions. Anyone who believes this to be glasnost is, in my view, either deluded or devious. This is only a semblance of glasnost. Look no further than the television program about restructuring in literature, with some of our very famous men of letters taking part. The writers spoke about glasnost and about democratic principles, but when one of them (I don't know who) was asked a question about Vladimir Vysotskiy—Who prevented him from publishing his poems?—the answer was full of pronouns: "Those who disliked him, those whom he impeded...." I don't think it is too much of a secret that many of "those" occupy their high offices and positions to this day, while some have gone even higher. Such people vote with glasnost with one hand, while with the other hand they are ready to use that same glasnost to shut up the next one who gets "too bold."

I believe that today these questions require a blunt answer. Even though it is, of course, understandable: Restructuring has only just started, and the bureaucrats have no intention of surrendering their positions without a struggle. But boldness is necessary! Without it, our people will never overcome the bureaucracy.

B. Zavudskiy, engineer at the "Signal" Plant, Kishinev

The discussions going on in the period of glasnost cannot fail to produce clashes of differing opinions, serious polemics, and sharp arguments. But some examples from polemical newspaper articles or speeches on radio and television or from the rostrum at meetings show that many of us have lost the habit of democratic forms of struggle between ideas and opinions. Democracy must also be learned, otherwise squabbles involving mutual insults may develop instead of proper discussions. The struggle of ideas, just like any struggle, must be waged according to certain rules without the use of prohibited methods. What do I mean?

Criticism of views must not be replaced by personal criticism. We must conduct discussions using arguments rather than emotions, labels, and insults. Finally, it is important to ensure equal opportunities for the sides involved in an argument.

Look at the published material on discussions. The discussion is almost always conducted by the one side, while the other side is essentially given no equal opportunity to express its views in the same newspaper. This "onesided game" is, of course, far removed from objectivity. It is time to finally grasp the fundamental idea expressed by M.S. Gorbachev that the period of democratization and glasnost resolutely rejects anybody's monopoly of truth.

Comrades, it is necessary to develop a normal atmosphere for the conduct of discussions. It is necessary to learn to respect one's opponent and to overcome one's own ambitions and belief in one's own infallibility. There are an extremely large number of questions for discussion, and some very complex questions at that. At this time we need discussions as much as the air that we breathe. The truth is born out of argument, but only out of arguments which are devoid of incorrect methods and dominated by a benevolent creative atmosphere.

Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Ivanov, Moscow

Criticism Must Arouse Desire for Change

WA18200138 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Apr 88 p 2

[Readers' letters by Z. Kovshova and A. Kharchenko—boldface and italics as published]

[Text]"He Came, He Saw...He Forgot" [subhead]

We presently talk a great deal about shortcomings and criticize to the utmost. Some are inclined to believe that this is democracy in the full sense of the word: Everyone can say what he wants. That is not how I think. Criticism must not only arouse indignation over our shortcomings, but must above all arouse the active desire to intervene immediately and to put things right.

It is not by chance that I am visited by reflections of this type. It bothers me that I, a Communist and a deputy of the nation's Supreme Soviet, cannot do anything to improve matters outside my own workplace.

Perestroyka has been in progress for 3 years. It would seem that this year has brought radical change, after all the work collective has obtained the right to independence, to initiative. But where are they to be found in actual life? We can criticize and pose questions until we are blue in the face, but matters will nevertheless be decided by the ministry whose directive determines the fate of the enterprise and its work force for many years in advance.

The combine has been knocking on departmental doors for at least two 5-year plans. The USSR Ministry of Light Industry sends our letters and our messengers to the republic ministry, where they throw up their hands and tell us to go to Moscow and see what we can accomplish there. Based on the collective's mandate, Hero of Socialist Labor P. Volnovinskaya, one of our weavers, met with V. Klyuyev, the minister, during the work of the 27th CPSU Congress. And the minister visited the combine.

But the minister did not have any intention of discussing serious matters with us. He ordered the people assembled so that he could read them the prepared speech he had brought with him. Everyone had a burning desire to know how they should work in the future and what

would become of the enterprise. They somehow managed to get Comrade Klyuyev talking. We did not get any concrete answer, but we exercised our democratic rights and at least had our say. The hope burned bright that the leader of the branch would not abandon us to our troubles. And indeed, in August 1986 we received an official document, signed by the minister, concerning the reconstruction and technical retooling of the Darnits Silk Combine under the 12th and 13th 5-Year Plans.

But our joy was premature. The document signed by V. Klyuyev in June 1987 said nothing about reconstruction, but only mentioned technical retooling. But where shall we put the new equipment if we do not basically refurbish the old premises and if we do not erect an auxiliary building? There is no answer to this question just as there is no clarity on the question of retooling. The minister wrote: "Inasmuch as our machine building and the machine building plants of CEMA [Council for Mutual Economic Assistance] countries do not produce certain types of production equipment required for finishing silk textiles, the UkrSSR Ministry of Light Industry must make provision for the delivery of the indicated equipment to the Darnits Silk Combine...on the basis of foreign currency proceeds from the sale of the output of the indicated enterprise on the foreign market."

Our minister is no newcomer to the textile industry. I think that Vladimir Grigoryevich is aware that 30-year old looms cannot turn out fabrics that can compete with foreign firms that modernize their looms every 3-4 years. How can there be any discussion of foreign currency?

Many questions arise. Above all, the question of the independence and rights of the work collective proclaimed by the Law on the Enterprise. One gets the impression that democratization does not apply to the branch's upper echelons.

Z. Kovshova, weaver, Darnits Silk Combine; deputy, USSR Supreme Soviet

"Will Workers Be Able To Manage a Plant?"[subhead] **I am an assembler on a ZIL production line. Our shop always performs its production program but there are many shortcomings and unresolved problems. The quality of assembly of trucks leaves much to be desired, brigade cost accounting is not being introduced, and working conditions in the shops are poor.**

The brigade I work in has a staff of 44. However, we have only 16 regular workers. The rest are drug treatment center patients in a work therapy program at ZIL and temporary workers. We need personnel and the neighboring sectors, where the situation is still worse, also need personnel.

But how can I, a worker, influence the solution of these questions that directly or indirectly affect my interests? There would seem to be many possibilities: to speak at a meeting, to appeal to management or the party committee, to right a note to the newspaper. There is probably no worker who has not at least once tried to demonstrate his activism. I, too, tried and saw how difficult it was to make people hear you out and understand, and that it was still more difficult to translate this understanding into tangible action.

Here is a situation where a proposal did not involve conflict and a lot of trouble, where the advantageousness of the proposal was obvious. State acceptance personnel found that bolts on the rear and front axle suspensions were not being tightened sufficiently. We reacted by assigning one more person to the assembly line. I appealed to the foreman: All that needs to be done is to buy a more powerful nut-driver costing less than 500 rubles and we can release the second person. The foreman showed no emotion whatsoever. "Such questions are decided by special people," he said, giving me to understand that I was interfering in something that was none of my business. Time passed, the "special people" did not appear, and the same nuts continued to be tightened by two people.

What about expressing one's opinion in written form? I was appointed to the editorial collegium of TREKHOSIK, our wall newspaper, for the purpose of livening it up. Last month I prepared three notes at the same time on the topic of improving quality and submitted them to V. Merzlikyan, the secretary of the shop's party bureau. A couple of days later, I went to see him and learn the result. "They won't do," he said. Concerning my interview with a visiting KamAZ quality control inspector of motor vehicle assembly lines, he noted that after reading this material, our people would defect to KamAZ. Concerning the notes on the quality control of trucks, Vasiliy Nikolayevich said: that is not your department, there are specialists.

It was impossible to know what to write about. So it was that the wall newspaper was not published.

My proposals on the public and just distribution of coupons for scarce products and on improving ventilation went unheeded. Real changes are within the power of managers and officials who evidently are pleased by or little disturbed by the existing state of affairs.

But there is a democratic production organ: the work collective council. It does exist. I asked 10 persons in my sector the name of the chairman of the work collective council. Only the eleventh person gave the correct answer: building chief I. Tarasov. What new possibilities became available to the collective after the election of a council headed by the same administrator? Formality.

Can a communist worker be in the vanguard if he is virtually unable to influence anything? Of course not. But we have to reconcile ourselves to the fact that the principal way the average communist can express his activism is to be exemplary in his work and to help a comrade.

Of course we workers have a great deal of confidence in perestroyka and in the actions of party leaders. But no less important is the makeup and example of those communists who work next to us—comrades in the shop or building party organization. I see that apathy in this area is not by any means diminishing.

Take our last open party meeting on 16 March. The topic was most important: the role of communists in raising product quality. What is more, I used the word "raising" only for the sake of decorum. In reality, the quality of our auto assembly work continues to decline. So the number desiring to speak was very small: only 6 persons. Attendance was very poor: only 10 persons out of 1500 noncommunists showed up.

The topic was urgent but turned out deadly boring. People went up to the rostrum with minor issues that could have been resolved at a planning meeting or in the course of the work.

Is this not the reason why front-rank workers, at least at ZIL, are in no hurry to join the party?

It is an alarming fact that the size of the party organization in our building is diminishing. Naturally there is a certain increase, but some are becoming members of the CPSU to further their career. I noticed the same thing back when I was serving in the Army. Some of the fellows openly spoke of how to make things work to their advantage in civilian life. And here, too, those who see themselves as a senior foreman or a deputy shop chief in a short period of time eagerly submit their applications [for party membership].

Workers, however, who have no desire to be promoted are cajoled and coaxed, frequently to no avail. It seems to me that assembler N. Orekhova belongs in the party. She has done a very good, an exemplary job here for a long time—12 years. She would not be opposed to think about joining the CPSU, but she wonders about the possibilities that might open up for improving the work.

Even the prestige of our shop party bureau is low. It closes its eyes to many shortcomings. There are clearly also many reasons for this. Can a part-time party bureau secretary go against the administration, i.e., a shop chief in a conflict situation? Judging by our V. Merzliken, he cannot, especially because he is numbered as one of our workers, but he is a *de facto* [full-time] secretary (like our [full-time] trade union and Komsomol leaders). The material well-being of the party bureau secretary depends entirely on the kindness of the shop chief who wields many levers to make things go his way.

I know that our production facility is not the only one that is in a difficult situation. Can communist workers prevent the situation from worsening? Hardly. But what about communist managers? It is their direct obligation. Did they perhaps not have enough help from us? Yes, only there is a sense of alienation between workers and managers. And it is becoming more pronounced in our building, for example. The managers obviously consider all of us to be tricksters and alcoholics. And believe that the foremen are just like us. You request sick leave and they look suspiciously at you as if to say: Don't smoke, don't drink, and you won't have that cough.

Workers retaliate in kind. If you go into any office in the administration building, you will see people drinking tea and making personal telephone calls. Shop chiefs address almost all workers using the familiar *"ty"* [form when addressing you]; sector chiefs can curse out a subordinate.

I cannot refrain from making one more proposal. The solution lies more in replacing management "in the name of the workers" by worker self-management. Our building has been converted to cost accounting but our brigade has not; we live according to the law of wage-leveling. This is a contradiction that should be eliminated in a shorter space of time. Brigades should be given broad cost accounting rights. It will then be possible to appreciably reduce management personnel, to reduce the time it takes to resolve production questions, and to raise wages. There is a great deal of promise in direct ties with *smezhniki* [factories producing parts for use by another], in the exchange of information (it would be enough to install several telephones in the brigade zone), in imposing sanctions or handing out rewards directly rather than going through the upper levels of management.

At present, it sometimes happens that during the entire shift we receive certain flawed parts that we are supposed to assemble. Very frequently our signals do not even reach the *smezhniki*, are lost somewhere "up above," and the guilty parties are not even aware that they are doing wrong. Of course, there are no fines whatsoever. We put the flawed parts to one side and that is all. Give the brigades independence and the necessary rights and this will not happen. Can we further tolerate the disgrace of having five flaw-correction sectors in our five basic shops?

I submit that direct ties should be established not only with suppliers but also with customers and service links. The workers themselves perform quality control operations. Each member of the brigade has full information on the technical, production, and economic activity of their sector and shop. Questions relating to the replacement of equipment and to the change of technology are decided and the KTU [coefficient of labor participation] is submitted at the meeting. The optimal size of such a brigade is 10-15 persons.

Of course, we must learn. What kind of masters of production are we if we have a poor knowledge of the state of affairs at a plant and in the branch? A political

class discussed the Ford assembly line—no one knows how things were organized there. We very approximately know the principles of cost accounting to say nothing of the subtleties.

Do the workers want to manage production? For the most part, yes. Do they admit their impotence before the bureaucratic wall? What can I do to remedy the situation? In reality, all I can do is propose an idea for discussion.

Am I proposing another utopia? I gave a draft of this note to my comrades. The workers say they agree entirely, but once again they doubt that anything will change. Shop chiefs and foremen are surprised at the idea of management without managers. They think I went too far...

A. Kharchenko, assembler, fitter at ZIL Plant, Shop No 1; CPSU member

'People's Initiative' for Reform Neglected

PM0405114088 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Vladislav Serikov, identified in front-page A. Plutnik profile as formerly "team leader on Arctic construction sites" and now "deputy director of the Scientific Organization of Labor Center of the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia Regions": "What Is Hindering Restructuring?"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] Boldness and cowardice, glasnost and lack of glasnost are combined in an astonishing way in life today. We say, for instance, that no zones are above criticism. A zone is a territory. There are indeed fewer such territories all the time. Formerly, for instance, you could not "touch" Moscow—now, you can. You could not offend some of the high-ranking bodies—now, you can. But we used to have people who were above criticism, and we still do. Apparently in any city, if it is neglected and full of garbage, we can now address reproaches to any leader at city or oblast level, right up to the obkom first secretary. But in Moscow? I have been to a great many cities, and I can say with authority: Moscow is probably one of the most neglected. I am not alone in seeing this—many people see it, but nobody will say personally to the Moscow leadership: Why do such things happen in your city? Why are we beginning to elevate to the ranks of the infallible people who are ordinary, normal people, people who, I am convinced, would not themselves want to be seen as infallible?

Is not this a trivial matter? No, it is far from trivial. Much stems from this. I remember the stormy times that began after the 20th party congress. I remember the upsurge of initiative and people's enthusiasm that followed it. They were magnificent years of labor. But the enthusiasm began to fade, the initiative to decline. Of course, half-heartedness in the economic transformations played a part, but changes in the moral atmosphere of our life also had their effect. Then the infallible ones appeared again, and basically we ended up back where we started. I myself felt the consequences of this, I saw it all with my own eyes when I was working in the north. I saw how it became increasingly difficult to maintain enthusiasm in the team through incredible efforts. Close at hand, collectives were already becoming demoralized; there was already slipshod work and neglect for technology; materials were rotting, and indifference reigned. So now I say, I shout, at the top of my voice: There must be no names that we utter only to praise them. Has history not taught us yet that this always ends badly?

After the 20th congress, there was an explosion of glasnost that cannot even be compared, in my view, with today's. But perhaps that is only an illusion. Because for 30 years there had been dead silence in the country; not a word could be said aloud. And suddenly people started talking, and talking loudly, heatedly. But... We did not even notice how we were dragging many of the shortcomings of the past into our own day. Voluntarism, decree methods of leadership—all this was taken from that very past that was so resolutely condemned, that we were so utterly sick of. You would have thought that by condemning what had happened, we would collect our wits and no longer allow anything to happen that would require collective blindness. Alas, remember the corn that we began to sow right up to the North Pole.

I remember calling on a raykom secretary in the little town of Nikel. They call him from Moscow: How are you doing with the queen of the fields? This year you are experimental; we are moving corn into the Far North. He stands there, terrified. We will start later he says. How much later? It's the end of June, and the snow is still lying. Look, they say, don't leave it too late; the snow will go—bring the sowing equipment out quickly....

While fulminating against the past, we feared, at that time, to mention the present. The mistakes that originated before our eyes, in our own day, so to speak—we did not point them out. The corn, supposedly, was not a mistake; the slaughter of personal livestock: Everything was correct and as it should be. The most terrible voluntarism was being perpetrated, but once again there was a conspiracy among us not to notice anything of the kind. Thousands of villages were declared hopeless, demolished, and plowed up, and they built the pulp and paper combine on Baykal. There, true, some people did try to put in a word for Baykal, but the resistance was weak, ineffective, and futile. Blind obedience, self-interested and selfless, broke down all obstacles. What can you call that? I don't know....

There was a great deal, a very great deal of innovation of various kinds, good and bad. There was innovation which was taken to the utmost absurdity, bordering on crime. The most surprising thing is that it did not particularly worry anyone, the majority of people, even those who understood very well what was what, pretended that everything was going correctly and that we

were on the only true path.... Was it not absurd to divide the party into urban and rural, and organize industrial and agricultural obkoms? Was it not a crime to eliminate the private sector throughout the country? Now, thank goodness, we are looking at many things with new eyes. We are, for instance, rolling up our sleeves and setting about restoring a great many villages which were hastily declared hopeless. We are handing them over for family contracts. But rectifying serious mistakes takes years, or even decades. It would have been far easier not to commit them. That would have meant listening to the people—constantly, always. Surely somebody must have realized even then that full communism would not be built by 1980, that peasants must have their plot and keep livestock? That the orientation toward full supplies through state trade (and in the evening, after work, let everyone, to a man, sing and dance in amateur groups) was profoundly erroneous? Many people understood all that. But they were silent, having no opportunity, or being reluctant, to contradict.

It seems to me that even today, after the 27th CPSU Congress, a silence complex afflicts many people, at all levels. After the 20th Komsomol Congress, I met with young people a great deal. One Komsomol raykom secretary—I will not mention his name; unfortunately, he is not the only one, because many Komsomol leaders are still very much the same—suddenly started saying, "strictly between ourselves," that in their rayon the collective contract is not being properly introduced, people have lost all interest in it, and they are tired of struggling to secure normal working conditions, even for good wages. I said to him: You should not be whispering about that; you should be shouting it from public platforms. Why do you not talk about it? He replied: "You are already a certain age and have nothing to lose. I still have everything ahead of me." If people like that really have "everything ahead" of them, no good will come of it for us.

Because of "daredevils" like that, a kind of half-hearted glasnost and curtailed democracy spring up. We shout at the tops of our voices to protest against what has already been condemned from above, even if the corresponding resolutions exist on this score. But we often cannot pluck up the courage to voice our doubts about something that has not yet been discussed in "certain spheres," about which there is no "unequivocal opinion." Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, recently asked me: "How do you think restructuring is going in construction?" I replied: "At the moment, it's like the taiga—noisy high up, silent low down." He laughed. We in the Politburo, he said, know that saying. [passage omitted]

Observing many of today's instances, I recall again and again the reform of the sixties and wonder why it "did not work." Here is the conclusion I am inclined to draw: That reform was a large-scale economic experiment that was conducted incorrectly. It was conducted OVER PEOPLE'S HEADS, while it should have been conducted TOGETHER WITH PEOPLE [capitalized words as published]. Ideas were divorced from people, and nothing came of it. Now, it is another matter: The experience exists, the emphasis is on democratization, councils of labor collectives have appeared, for instance, and now we can and must carry out the reform together with people. But in practice, people are often still not taking part in the reforms. The enormous potential of the people's initiative is still not being brought into play. [passage omitted]

Status of Those Injured at Chernobyl Noted

LD0405143488 Hamburg DPA in German 1347 GMT 4 May 88

[Excerpt] Berlin (DPA)—At the moment no more of the 205 seriously injured in the Chernobyl catastrophe are being treated in a hospital. Of the 40 who were most seriously injure, 31 have died, the remainder are out of danger. This was reported today by Aleksandr Smirnov and Vyacheslav Ryshko of the USSR Hematological Research Center to journalists in Berlin. Both blood specialists are spending 10 days in Berlin at the invitation of Dr Klaus-Peter Hellriegel of the Department of Internal Medicine at the Moabit Hospital. [passage omitted]

Academician Explores Historical Ethnic Issues

PM0405111988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview under the rubric "Viewpoint" with Academician Yu.V. Bromley, full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Ethnography, by A. Plutnik: "'We Live in the Same Home'"; date and place not given—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Our interlocutor is Yulian Vladimirovich Bromley, full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Ethnography. He was graduated from secondary school in 1939 and entered the Physics Faculty at Moscow State University but was soon called up for military service. He spent 1941-1945 at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War, which he began near Brest and ended in Berlin. He returned to the university after an enforced break of 6 years, this time to the History Faculty. He is now studying the theory of the ethnos, methodological questions of ethnographic science, and problems where ethnography, history, and sociology overlap.

[Plutnik] History has become a best-seller. Why?

[Bromley] The splurge of interest in history started brewing long ago: It is inseparably linked with the growth of the people's cultural and educational level and the growth of their awareness. With the realization that traditions are our roots. All this, however, is rather

trivial. The chief thing, obviously, is the fact that interest in the historical past usually increases sharply at crucial periods in peoples' lives. And we are living at just such a time.

[Plutnik] We are witnessing what is, essentially, a striking phenomenon. Under conditions of glasnost people have been enabled to learn more about a great deal. This has sharply stimulated not just interest but also the need for truth and justice. It is probably no coincidence that the growth of national awareness is being manifested so clearly precisely under the new conditions?

[Bromley] Of course it is no coincidence. By opening certain "valves," the democratization process has uncovered (which is not a bad thing but a good thing) previously hidden aspects of tension in interethnic relations. The growth of national awareness should not, in itself, be identified with nationalism, which is characterized by a desire to ensure privileges for one nationality at another's expense. The specific reasons for the emergence of negative phenomena in the sphere of national awareness and, accordingly, also in national relations themselves have now shown up more clearly. They are reasons which cannot be reduced, as was usually done, exclusively to survivals from the past and to the impact of foreign propaganda, although these factors too must not be disregarded.

It seems quite obvious that the undesirable collisions in the sphere of national relations have been caused primarily by the stagnation phenomena which occurred in the life of our society in the recent past and which still make themselves felt. They range from deformations in the economy to various violations of social justice. The low growth rates for labor productivity in both industry and agriculture in a number of republics, the disproportions among them in the availability of labor resources, the growing differences in backup for the sociocultural infrastructure—all this is projected onto the nationalities sphere to one degree or another. Violations of the principles of internationalism in questions of training and placing cadres and the inadequate attention in a number of instances to the cultural, linguistic, and everyday interests of separate national groups within republics also have an effect. And such groups which live outside the eponymous republics, or which do not have such eponymous republics at all, total, in all, more than 55 million people, that is, 20 percent of the country's population (in other words, more than the entire population of France). And it is precisely they who largely predetermine actual national relations on a personal level in the republics.

Increasing attention toward them does not mean forgetting about large national communities. Many problems have accumulated here too: the more harmonious combination of all-union and republican interests, the raising of the republics' contribution to the all-union kitty in accordance with their increased economic and spiritual potential, the consistent implementation of the principle of social justice in their relations.

[Plutnik] The internationalization of culture is taking place everywhere in the modern world. So why has a thirst for the national suddenly become so clearly apparent?

[Bromley] We are dealing here with a so-called ethnic paradox of modern times. The process of internationalization, which, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, intensively broke down national barriers back at the beginning of our century, really is being substantially intensified under conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. Accordingly, the specific ethnic nature of the peoples' culture is becoming increasingly weak. At the same time, it might seem that its subjective expression—ethnic awareness—must also grow weaker. However, the opposite is happening in life: It is growing stronger everywhere.

One of the most common causes accounting for the paradox is the development of means of mass communication under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. Thanks to them, on the one hand, distances are being reduced, as it were, between representatives of a single people and contacts are being intensified between them, while, on the other, interethnic differences are becoming increasingly palpable. As a polyethnic power, the USSR is a dynamic organism. Every people has individual spheres of social life (from the economy and demography to culture and psychology) which not only incorporate historically evolved differences but also change with far from identical intensity. Incidentally, this is a precondition of contradictions in the sphere of the ethnonational processes taking place in the country. The changes are particularly striking in the sphere of demography. During 1959 through 1979 the numerical strength of the East Slavic peoples—Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians—increased just 18.8 percent, that is, the growth rate was lower than the average for the USSR (25.5 percent). At the same time, the numerical strength of the Turkic-speaking peoples increased almost 72 percent. This leads, in particular, to a shortage of manpower resources being felt in regions settled by some peoples, while the problem of manpower resource utilization arises in others.

As for the desire to place a higher value on the distinctive features of one's own ethnonational culture, this is natural. Internationalization under both capitalism and socialism promotes the emergence of this trend, which is undoubtedly progressive, since it saves mankind from cultural monotony.

A harmonious, considered approach to the correlation of traditions and innovations in culture is needed. However, where the process of internationalization is particularly intensive, it is sometimes perceived as threatening the total loss of one's ethnic distinctiveness. Hence the

revival of religion, which is perceived as a reliable link with the past and as an assertion of one's ethnic distinctiveness. Hence the desire of people to shut themselves off in their own ethnonational culture. This orientation threatens serious dangers: It disunites the peoples, each of which appeals only to its own forebears.

[Plutnik] But the progressive trend, of which you spoke, sometimes entails serious interethnic conflicts. Is such an exacerbation of relations—associated with the growth of national awareness—something fated?

[Bromley] Certainly not inevitably. And yet this phenomenon can provide favorable soil for such conflicts under certain conditions, because all spheres of the life of society—above all, socioeconomic, cultural-ideological, and territorial-political contradictions—are projected onto interethnic relations. It is no coincidence that almost all the clashes that occur nowadays, all the hot spots on the planet, whether in the Near East or Southeast Asia, in southern Africa or Latin America—they all have to some extent an ethnonational, ethnoreligious, or ethnoracial slant. The conflicts in Ulster, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, and the RSA are particularly revealing.

[Plutnik] For a long time we considered that these were not our problems, as it were. But then there came the Alma-Ata events at the end of 1986, the demands of the Crimean Tatars, last year's demonstrations in the Baltic republics, and the recent events around Nagornyy Karabakh. The cheerful tones which prevailed in the illumination of national relations in the USSR seem to have lulled us to such an extent that the opposite trend—a certain skepticism about our achievements in this sphere—has now emerged. Sometimes the impression might even be created that the national is pushing the social into the background, as it were.

[Bromley] But that is just an outward impression, since national phenomena are, as a rule, more obvious than deep-seated socioeconomic processes. What is undoubtedly most important in mankind's destiny is not national or, to use the now accepted international terminology, ethnic problems, but its social progress in the broad sense of the word, including the irreversibility of peaceful coexistence. And this should on no account be forgotten, particularly as factors relating to very different spheres of social life lie, in the final analysis, behind all ethnic problems, which, incidentally, are themselves social problems.

And yet it would probably be no great exaggeration to say that ethnic subjects are increasingly being advanced to the forefront together with the struggle for peace, ecological problems, and questions of health care and are acquiring global features.

The collisions noted in no way obscure the real achievements of Lenin's nationalities policy. I would say that they make us value them more and be more profoundly and fully aware of the great historic significance of the Soviet Union's social experiment in implementing the principles of internationalism in the life of a multinational country.

[Plutnik] What is the role of historical knowledge in the phenomena now to be observed in the sphere of national relations?

[Bromley] It is substantial. For one of the most important constituents of every person's ethnic, national awareness is the notion of the commonality of the historical destiny of all the members of the ethnos to which he belongs. However, as an analysis of the ethnic history of mankind shows, this "subjective" component comes to the forefront all the more, the weaker the opportunities for appealing to objective features of the culture of one's own ethnos become. It is no coincidence that, when turning to history and to the past, people now are interested not so much in the history of Britain, Italy, or the United States, not so much in other people's history as in their own—our internal history. This interest has acquired a clearly expressed national and, I would add, local nature. Russians want most of all to know the history of the Russian people; Yakuts that of the Yakut people; Letts that of the Lettish people. And so forth.

[Plutnik] How does science explain this?

[Bromley] We are essentially paying for the fact that for too long we considered the nationalities question solved and did not attach serious significance to the deep-seated processes which never ceased. And then what was almost a competition began among the peoples: Who is more ancient, whose civilization is older? Certain seekers after "truth" try to find arguments in their favor in the annals of history. The search is frequently conducted in a way that is diametrically opposed to the scientific way. Not for the sake of ascertaining the most important interdependences of the object being studied but according to the principle of seeking the "primordial shoot." Here it is presupposed that this shoot originally possessed the basic properties characteristic of the ethnos and which are regarded, moreover, as immutable. Meanwhile, the more ancient the roots, the wider they spread and the greater the area they cover. There is not a single people existing on earth today in a pure form, so to speak. Over the centuries everything has gotten mixed up and crossed—tribes, peoples.

[Plutnik] It is clear that all the problems of which you have just spoken, as well as many others, did not arise yesterday or today. And they provided no grounds for claiming that we had solved the nationalities question. Nevertheless, this thesis did emerge and went down in program documents. Just who made such a "diagnosis"?

[Bromley] The problem is not as simple as it might appear at first sight. The thing is that before the revolution the resolution of the nationalities question was associated, above all, with the elimination of the peoples'

inequality and national oppression. And in that sense the nationalities question which we inherited from the past has undoubtedly been resolved. But life does not stand still, and new problems arise even under socialism, including in the sphere of national relations, and since there are problems, consequently the question also exists.

For a long time the sphere of national relations essentially remained a closed zone. Stagnation trends made themselves felt sharply here, which was manifested, in particular, in a number of salutatory cliches characterizing national processes.

The very concept of "nation" still needs certain amplification. The discussion of this question conducted in the pages of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII in the late sixties failed to introduce sufficient clarity. It ended the same way it began. The final article virtually reproduced the definition once given by I.V. Stalin. And that was not sufficiently full. You might think this was not such an important matter, just a question of a scientific term. However, owing to the unconditional assertion and dissemination of Stalin's definition of a nation, the whole diveristy of national (ethnic) communities was virtually reduced to one variety of them. As a result, on the one hand, chief attention was devoted to compactly settled large national communities—nations, above all, but partly to ethnic groups. On the other hand, various national groups—chiefly scattered ones, so-called national minorities—were left out of the picture. Yet it was precisely toward them that V.I. Lenin perspicaciously demanded extreme attention. But, alas, he did not have the last word here. This was expressed, in particular, in the elimination of national rayons and national rural soviets, which had numbered more than 5,000 in the early thirties. At a certain historical stage we did not have a single practical organization engaged specially on national problems.

[Plutnik] Those who are tackling them particularly actively today include ethnographers. Yet we are accustomed to thinking that ethnography studies the traditional culture and life of peoples, habitation, clothing, ceremonies, folk art, and so forth—in short, that it can in no way find itself at the sharp end of national problems.

[Bromley] Indeed, the chief task of ethnography was long defined in just this way. But the point is that, by conducting a daily study of the cultural and social features of our country's peoples, ethnographers came to possess diverse specific knowledge about these peoples. When a realistic characterization of contemporary national processes was needed, this knowledge proved, in a way, unique at that time. That is the first point. Second, a definite role was played by the elaboration of the theoretical bases of ethnographic science and, above all, the theory of its chief subject, the ethnos, which began back in the sixties and has not ceased since then. A number of coterminous disciplines were created at the interface between ethnography and sociology, demography, ecology, psychology, and so forth. This string of satellites enabled us to take a comprehensive approach to national problems. Precisely such an approach is extremely important for their study.

[Plutnik] Does it not seem to you that many people today are turning to history with just this aim of restoring a realistic picture? For the ordinary reader, popular scientific books, textbooks, and also journal, and even newspaper, articles are the chief source of his knowledge in this area. There are also, it is true, solid monographs by modern historians. But why, despite the abundance of research of this kind, are prerevolutionary authors particularly popular now? Karamzin, Solovyev, Klyuchevskiy?

[Bromley] It is obviously because people are seeking in these authors' works the answer to questions to which they find no answers in modern literature. Of course, such a reader will get from prerevolutionary historians many interesting facts from our country's civilian history and many vivid descriptions of events. True, it must be remembered that these works not only contain factual material but interpret it from definite ideological positions. Sometimes it is not so easy to get to the bottom of this.

[Plutnik] If we look at the history of historical science itself, it is not hard to notice that the muse Clio frequently held a place of honor in a number of very ancient scientific professions which sometimes contended with journalism, not without success, for the title of the second oldest profession. Even historians who had a reputation for being legislators of fashions claimed now one thing, now another, on one and the same thing; they radically revised their theories and concepts, changed formulas, and rewrote textbooks. Recall, for example, such a celebrated work as the "Short History Course of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)."

[Bromley] The thing is that, although we denied the well-known formula according to which "history is policy tipped into the past," it was, in fact, frequently implemented. A considerable role in this was played precisely by the "Short History Course of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)." However, it all began considerably earlier—during the debate on the social sciences in the late twenties and early thirties. That debate undoubtedly played an important role in the development of Soviet historical science. However, its significance is far from unambiguous; not only the positive aspect but also much that is negative in it dates from those times. True, the debate did begin quite democratically, but it gradually assumed an increasingly dogmatic nature and was accompanied by an increasingly fierce struggle. The publication of Stalin's letter "On Some Questions of the History of Bolshevism" in the journal PROLETARSKAYA REVOLYUTSIYA played a very important role in changing the course of the debate. Books appeared with very significant titles,

such as "The Class Enemy on the Historical Front," "Ethnography in the Service of the Class Enemy," and so forth. Repressions among historians followed. I remember the story of my father, Vladimir Sergeyevich Sergeyev, professor of history. He was in charge of a department at Moscow State University and had written the first Soviet textbooks on antiquity for universities. A.A. Zhdanov had entrusted a group of five scientists, including my father, with creating a general history textbook for party schools and explained that events must be set forth vividly, truthfully, and intelligibly. It was 1937. Of the coauthors, only my father was still alive, and only a miracle had saved him from repression. But he did not live long after that—less than 4 years. When I graduated from school and told him that I was thinking of entering the history faculty, my father, who was always so attentive and patient, suddenly retorted sharply: Go where you like, only not to the history faculty. He knew that history at that time was a minefield.

[Plutnik] At that time, as we are learning today, there were many danger zones. The truth had been mined. Like-mindedness was required, and people who do not know the truth are more willing to think what they are told to think.

[Bromley] Pluralism of views is a most valuable social acquisition of the times of restructuring. During the days of the revolutionary renewal of society, their certain polarization is even inevitable. Well-reasoned polemics are the most democratic and, at the same time, effective form of struggle against those who resist restructuring. Not only science but also all social life cannot develop without open debate. The process of cognition is endless. It is incompatible with stagnation.

Contradictions are inherent in all development, and the national processes in the USSR are not devoid of them, either. I will repeat: Deformations in the sphere of national relations are certainly not inevitable for socialism. Therefore, the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society now being carried out by the CPSU is assuming paramount significance for the further harmonious development of national relations in the USSR.

We must give thorough consideration to the mechanisms ensuring the orientation of each Soviet person's national awareness—above all, toward goals that are common to our entire country and to the entire Soviet people. Correspondingly, we must approach nationalities problems from general Soviet positions, above all.

Unresolved Nationalities Questions Detailed

PM021521 Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Apr 88 pp 1, 2

[Article by Prof S. Kaltakhchyan, RSFSR Honored Scientist, under the "Reflections on Important Matters" rubric: "The National and the International"—boldface as published]

[Excerpt] The nationalities question has always been one of the most acute and sensitive issues of social development. And it was the USSR, the most multinational socialist country, which first resolved it in the form in which we received it from the past. This point is also made in the new edition of the CPSU Program. This reality is denied by bourgeois ideologists. They claim that the "virus of nationalism infects capitalism and socialism equally." Recently this idea has been stealing into the writings of some authors in our press. How can we say that the nationalities question is resolved, they ask, when we look at the events which took place in Alma-Ata in December 1986, in the Baltic republics last year, and quite recently in Nagorno-Karabakh, Azerbaijan, and Armenia? In other words, the existence of national problems (or of their aggravation, when such problems are not settled promptly) is deemed sufficient reason to denigrate the significance of the formation of the Soviet people as a unique social and international community of people.

Lenin considered the essence of the solution of the nationalities question to be the unification of the working people regardless of their nationality. In the USSR it was based on the elimination of the former national oppression, the establishment of political equality of all the peoples, the organization of fraternal cooperation and friendship, the equalizing of the standards of economic and cultural development of all nationalities, and the attainment of their actual equality. Soviet people are rightly proud of all this.

The claim that "the nationalities question is solved" cannot, of course, be taken to mean that all questions of national relations have been resolved. National oppression and national inequality, which existed under tsarism and which still exist in capitalist countries, have been eliminated. This is one of socialism's world historic achievements. **But the fact that the nationalities question has been largely resolved in our country does not mean that national relations in the USSR are without problems.** There are certain national problems inherited from the past and other new ones constantly arising which require more attention.

They include the discovery of better paths for the development of socialist nations and ethnic groups, their economic integration, state organization, and cultural development, the struggle against all manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism, and local favoritism, the elimination of the distorted manifestation of national sentiments, the raising of the standard of international contact, and the inculcation of socialist internationalism. Some people claim that these are secondary questions. I cannot agree, because unless these "secondary" questions are solved then in a multinational state other problems of building the new society and of the revolutionary restructuring of all social relations cannot be resolved either.

The task of developing an integrated national economic complex—the material basis of the prosperity and rapprochement of the nationalities—is of paramount significance. The USSR is the first socialist country in which

the economic integration of soviet republics has been achieved. They are all united in the system of the all-union division of labor based on economic regionalization, specialization, and cooperation. Considerable successes have been achieved on that path. It is particularly important to stress that each republic's achievements are the result of the total labor of all the Soviet people.

But no matter how great the successes are, the party has focused its main attention on eliminating the negative phenomena which have accumulated in the economic development of the republics and of the country as a whole. Recent Communist Party Central Committee plenums in Kazakhstan and the Central Asian republics noted the slow growth in national detachments of the working class, the adverse effect of archaic rural traditions, and the high percentage of the abie-bodied population (17-30 percent) not engaged in socially useful labor. In those republics, as in others, individual instances of local favoritism and national arrogance are to be seen. And all of this, of course, has an adverse effect on national relations.

It should be noted in particular that the rights of autonomous republics and oblasts are still frequently violated. The example of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO) showed graphically that any replacement of democratic centralism by bureaucratic centralism may actually negate the autonomous rights of an oblast, retard its social, economic, and cultural development, and shackle local initiative. To a considerable extent that was the cause of the well known events in the NKAO, I believe, and not a simple desire to affiliate to Armenia...

Nowadays, economic ties in the single national economic complex are not directly dependent on where the republics' borders run. Yes, each republic has its own territory with its historical borders, which however do not make the republic a separate fatherland. At the same time this does not mean that the national territory loses all significance entirely. Here is what V.I. Lenin said. At the Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party (Bolsheviks), he stressed that "the party demands broad autonomy at oblast level, the abolition of supervision from above, the abolition of an obligatory state language, the establishment of the borders of self-governing and autonomous oblasts on the basis of the local population's own consideration of economic and living conditions, the national composition of the population, and so forth." At the first All-Russian Congress of the Navy Lenin explained: "For us it matters not where the state border runs but that the alliance between the working people of all nations is preserved... Let the bourgeoisie engage in contemptuous petty squabbling and haggling over borders, the workers of all countries and all nations will not be divided on this squalid matter."

People may object that present-day practice presents a different picture. Yes, there are examples of that. But they are indeed evidence of how practice deviates from scientifically validated Leninist principles of national relations. In those places where national interests are to some extent still disregarded one finds a natural dissatisfaction and protests at the infringement of national equality.

During the twenties under Lenin a national demarcation was carried out in Central Asia on the basis of the ethnic composition of the region and the preferences of the population. Subsequently some changes were also made to the borders between Belorussia and Lithuania, the RSFSR and the Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. These changes were understood by Soviet people, who were striving to make rational use of the country's entire territory as the common property of the Soviet people. As the USSR Constitution says: **"The territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a single entity and comprises the territory of the union republics."** It must be remembered here that V.I. Lenin, taking up what F. Engels said about the need to take account of the population's feelings in the state organization of the peoples, also pointed out: "The national composition of the population is **one** of the most important economic factors but **not the only or the most important** among them... Therefore Marxists must not base themselves wholly or exclusively on the 'national territorial' principle."

Unfortunately, a sense of belonging to a single Soviet people has not, in my view, been properly instilled in all Soviet people. Let us be frank: Is not the fact that, for example, there are still few people ready to leave the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics, with their surplus labor resources, to work in regions which are in need of manpower not a consequence of this? And in the Baltic republics protests can be heard against the influx of outside specialists, since this is said to decrease the ratio of the "indigenous population"...

As is well known, all Soviet republics are multinational, and this multinational nature continues to increase, which is undoubtedly a progressive phenomenon. It is important in this situation that the multinational state system express and defend the interests of not one but **all nationalities** living on the territory of a given republic. Mere calls to increase the level of relations among nationalities will yield nothing if no account is taken of social justice in respect of **all nations** when making budget appropriations, promoting leading cadres, and observing the principle of representation in various organs of power and public organizations.

Improving socialism presupposes satisfying the specific demands of all nationalities irrespective of whether thay are "indigenous" or "nonindigenous." I have put the latter words in quotation marks because, as researchers into national relations have repeatedly pointed out, the

use of these terms is not all useful, since many nationalities have lived and worked together in a given republic for centuries and are no less "indigenous" than the nationality whose name it bears. The national republic is as near and dear to them as it is to the indigenous population.

These questions, like problems concerned with improving the country's state and political structure, have not in recent years been the focus of attention. Nevertheless, given the internationalization of life, specific national questions do arise. Thus the problem of granting autonomy to certain large national minorities obviously exists. There are also a number of unresolved questions in the relations of union and autonomous republics and oblasts. Indifference and a lack of concern are out of place here. Disparity between word and deed, a verbal, sloganizing "solution" of national problems rather than an actual, real solution, and inconsistency in implementing Leninist norms requiring a careful, solicitous attitude to national interests have an unhealthy effect, hinder the development of an ethos conducive to contact among nationalities, and weaken the international cohesion of working people.

The complexities of the contradictory development of national cultures stand out more clearly in the context of restructuring. As people are aware, the culture of each nation and ethnic group forms an organic link in the cultural development of all mankind. The more developed a national culture is, the more elements common to all mankind are present in it. The concepts of "closed cultures" and "local civilizations," by denying their universal human character, present national culture as a unified culture regardless of its class nature. This runs directly counter to reality as reflected in Lenin's formula that: "There are two national cultures in every national culture."

Under socialism this Leninist concept is very important for the inculcation through history of a selective attitude to the cultural legacy of the past. Literature and art have a large role to play in this process of inculcation through history, and the revival of interest in the history of the fatherland and nationalities and their monuments can only be welcomed. Among some cultural figures, however, this interest has assumed an unhealthy character: The culture of each nation is sometimes presented as part of a "single stream," national character is counterposed to class character and "spirituality" to ideological commitment and party-mindedness.

V.I. Lenin, however, attached keynote significance to the concept of the "two cultures," applying it to all culture created by mankind, since in the culture of capitalist society its main internal contradiction is between bourgeois culture, on the one hand, and democratic and socialist cultures, on the other. Indeed democratic and socialist cultures form a genuine culture common to all mankind: They are values conducive to the progress of human society.

Another complication we meet with is confusion between the question of studying past culture and the question of what to take and what to discard from it. Lenin both before and after the October Revolution did not simply speak of the need to place a high value upon the consistently democratic and socialist elements in past culture but unambiguously stressed that we "...take them **alone and unconditionally** as a counterbalance to bourgeois culture..." Of course, a cultured person must have a good knowledge of the history of mankind and, in particular, his fatherland. It is specially important to understand our post-October history. The past must be known in all its fullness and completeness, but we must use only that in it which is really valuable and suitable for the development of the present, that which really enriches socialist culture.

The correct choice of true values is very important in cultural building. Here Lenin even before the revolution drew Communists' attention to the fact that the "question of the slogan 'national culture' is of enormous significance for Marxists not only because it defines the ideological content of all our propaganda and agitation on the nationalities question in contrast to bourgeois propaganda, but also because the whole program of notorious cultural-national autonomy has been based upon this slogan." Lenin roused all the party's theoretical forces at that time to combat this program, regarding "national-cultural autonomy" as a sophisticated and most insidious form of reactionary nationalism. "If the economy unites nations living in a single state," Lenin wrote, "the attempt to divide them once and for all is absurd and reactionary so far as the sphere of 'cultural' and in particular schooling questions are concerned." Lenin ridiculed those who, frightened by national conflicts, preached the organization of national curias and associations formed along national lines, seeking to fence nationalities off from one another in cultural affairs. [passage omitted]

'Brezhnev's Special Favor' Protected Corruption

PM0405093588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Apr 88 p 3

[Article by N. Kishkin, editor of TRUD's ideological department, in response to reader's letter under the "Correspondence With a Reader" rubric: "Bitter Truth or Sweet Illusions?"]

[Excerpts] "What sort of time are we living in? I am 70; I was an active participant in collectivization and expropriation of the kulaks and took part in the Great Patriotic War. It is painful for me and many veterans to see what is now occurring. It is simply incomprehensible: Day and night there are train crashes, shipwrecks, air disasters, aircraft hijacks, various crimes, antistate demonstrations, and strikes. It is incomprehensible why all this happens.

"Or take another example: Once it was accepted that every leader was a Communist. But now it transpires that one leader is a bribe-taker, another a careerist, bureaucrat, or embezzler of public funds!!! Shchelokov, Rashidov, Kunayev, Medunov and a number of others—who, then, is now to be believed???

"For us frontliners, the name of Stalin was supreme. We went into the attack 'for the Motherland and Stalin.' Now we abuse him while forgiving, pardoning, and rehabilitating everyone, although 50 years has passed now.

"Why stir all this up? How is all this to be understood? Please explain.

"P.I. Sokolov, labor and war veteran, Kiev" [passage omitted]

The whole point is that we have developed mainly not **thanks to** but **despite** [boldface words as published] Stalin and his ilk and have achieved through the sweat and blood of several generations what we could have achieved at much less cost. The past decades, after all, have not just been a time of victories but a time of lost opportunities. In 1948, at the height of Lysenkoism, genetics was smashed, and for decades we lagged behind developed countries, and our agriculture is still affected by this. Cybernetics was branded a pseudoscience, and we are now forced again to catch up.

How many bright minds—the most able organizers, great scientists, and talented military leaders—were lost during the years of mass repressions? Every country regards such intellects as part of its national wealth, but we condemned them to destruction. Just think of the people imprisoned as enemies—Marshal K. Rokossovskiy, aircraft designer A. Tupolev, Academician S. Korolev... And how many such people did not return to active work but perished without yielding up to the people all of which they were capable! What great strength these people must have possessed not to be broken or lose faith. That is why we now say that all subsequent generations are irremediably indebted to you—party, war, and labor veterans who fought, despite everything, for the cause. This also includes the army of leaders who during the years of the personality cult and the years of stagnation remained loyal to party principles. But, unfortunately, there were others.

You, Pavel Ivanovich, cite in your letter the names of people it is difficult even to pronounce without shame and anger. Where did they spring from, what generated them? One of the prime causes was that undemocratic system of power, which spread like cancer for decades. The setup was simple: A leader of genius who alone knew and understood everything stood atop the pyramid. His instructions were the law. It was the lot of everyone else not to discuss but to execute. Any doubt or, God forbid, disagreement was punished without fail.

After Stalin, we smashed only the most distorted part of the system, such as mass repressions for disobedience or suspicion of disobedience. But the old relationships were perpetuated. Every highly-placed leader was infallible. And if he, flouting the principle of collective decision-making, resolved all cadre questions himself, many drew the conclusion that winning favor was the main thing. Thus nepotism, string-pulling, and servility, which increasingly ousted party principledness, entered our life during the years of stagnation. Thus the number of untouchables, protected by highly-placed patrons, increased. The more immature people found themselves in this system, the more leaders divorced from the masses there were. The system began to breed degenerates.

The four people named by you figure among those who enjoyed Brezhnev's special favor, and that was enough for them to feel completely safe. What, you may say, did Shchelokov have to fear if one of his deputies was a bribe-taker but also the son-in-law of an important leader? Why should a minister not "live off investments"? USSR Deputy Prosecutor General Viktor Vasilyevich Naydenov, now deceased, paid with his job and his health for his attempt to completely expose the system of corruption in Krasnodar Kray, where Medunov held sway. Should we keep quiet about this? How those degenerates ensconsed in their old haunts would love that.

You ask who is to be believed. Let us believe ourselves, believe the healthy forces in the party which have not been afraid of the truth and have urged that most powerful force—the people—to work to renew socialism. The future now depends on us ourselves. The destruction of all that has impeded us while simultaneously creating something bright and new make up the dialectics of restructuring.

Our discussion can probably be summarized as follows. What, after all, is better: the bitter truth or sweet illusions of prosperity? I think that you, Pavel Ivanovich, will on mature reflection draw the only correct conclusion. No matter how bitter the medicine, it must be swallowed if you wish to live. And we want to live, and live better with each year. We want Leninist ideals to be turned into real deeds, not to serve as embellishments for phrasemongers' speeches.

Inevitability of Stalin Personality Cult Viewed

PM021031 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No. 18, 30 Apr-6 May 88 (Signed to Press 28 Apr 88) pp 4, 5

[Interview with Academician A.M. Samsonov by correspondent V. Polozhentsev under the rubric "Let's Take a Look": "Was the Personality Cult Inevitable?"; date and place of interview not given—first paragraph is ARGUMENTY I FAKTY introduction]

[Text] This was the topic of our correspondent's, V. Polozhentsev's, conversation with eminent historian, Academician A.M. Samsonov.

Correspondent: Judging from numerous items in the press and from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY readers' letters, the question of attitudes toward I.V. Stalin has become one of the most painful questions for the Soviet public. How could it happen that Stalin's merciless dictatorship took hold in the country which accomplished the October Revolution, a country with revolutionary traditions?

Samsonov: I think that there is no point in reducing all our history to just "Stalin's merciless dictatorship" or just his personality. Our past consists primarily of the heroic struggle waged by the USSR peoples under the Communist Party's leadership to restore the ruined national economy and to build a socialist society. By breaking away from semifeudal Russia with its underdeveloped economy, poor culture, and illiteracy, we managed to solve a most complex historical task—to erect the grandiose edifice of socialism. Had we not done that, we would have been unable to withstand the trials of the struggle against fascist aggression.

I do not advocate that all of our history should be painted strictly in black hues—that would be a gross distortion of it. It is necessary to comprehensively and objectively show how we marched along a totally uncharted path, how we made truly historical gains. But we should not stop there, either. The historical process is always ambiguous, contradictory, and complex, and black or dark hues are inevitable in its spectrum.

Our state, with its historically advanced system, also contained phenomena which deformed this system and at times made it assume ugly and criminal forms. We link these deformities primarily with the name of Stalin and his cult.

Centralized power was justified in the first years of the Soviet state's existence—it was necessary to solve the most complex tasks in the shortest possible time, but legality was not violated at that time. But centralization dragged on for too long and became unmanageable under Stalin.

Correspondent: Could the fact that the personality cult established itself in our country have been law-governed, a manifestation of the common tendency of peoples in underdeveloped countries toward diktat by a strong personality? In other words, could it have been that the people needed the cult and the people created it?

Samsonov: Not a single dictatorship has even asked the people's permission for its existence. Take Italy or Germany in that same period, the thirties. Their social and political conditions were different from ours.

There was no historical law which would have doomed our society to Stalin's cult with all its terrible consequences. When we historians analyze the past, we at times overestimate the role of the objective and underestimate the role of the subjective factors in history. Despite a whole series of causes which led to the establishment of rigid discipline in our state (including the class struggle, which extended right up to the laying of the foundations of socialism, and the encirclement by imperialism), it is immoral to justify excessive cruelty and inhumanity. Let us imagine that, despite all the objective conditions prevailing at the time, the party Central Committee and the state had been headed not by Stalin, but by someone else, someone worthier. One could mention a whole series of outstanding figures from the Lenin guard, including M.V. Frunze, S.M. Kirov, and Ya.E. Rudzutak, who were intellectually and morally much more suitable for this position. It is hardly possible to dispute the fact that no such perversion of democratic principles would have occurred, in any case, not on such a scale and in such forms as it actually did.

The role of the subjective factor must not be underestimated, but it ought not to be overestimated, either. After all, it was not Stalin alone who committed the crimes of which we are talking today. The cult would not have been created had Stalin encountered a united resistance. But there was no such resistance, and anyone who tried to protest perished. The main responsibility for all this lies with Stalin, but there were also his closest associates, who supported him blindly, there were also those who carried out his orders, not only people who were forced to do so, but also those who made a career of dealing with unsuitable people. In short, there was an entire unprincipled mechanism whose driving force was, without any question, Stalin.

Correspondent: Western Sovietologists claim that had our country not had a one-party system in the thirties, the establishment of the personality cult would have been impossible. Do you agree?

Samsonov: Our one-party system had already taken shape under Lenin. Of course the causes of the cult are not rooted in the one-party system. Had our system existed without gross violations of the principles of democratic centralism, had legality been observed, there could have been no cult. But what happened in our country was that centralism alone developed unilaterally, gradually evolving into administrative-edict centralism, while the level of society's democratization went into dangerous decline. Therefore, all the misfortunes of the personality cult resulted not from the one-party system, but from the violations of this system and ultimately from violations of the foundations of the Soviet Constitution.

Correspondent: Even today, there are quite a few people devoted to Stalin, who believe that our country needs "a firm hand." You have probably seen for yourself photographs of Stalin stuck on car windshields.

Samsonov: In my view, one of the reasons behind this phenomenon is the mistaken idea that all the best parts of our history, all the gains of which we are proud, are linked with Stalin's name. This myth did not develop

accidentally, it was implanted by mass media and propaganda over decades. This was often encouraged by those who enjoyed the people's trust and respect in view of their former combat service.

All spheres of our economic and cultural building, of our science and art, and finally our military might were being linked with Stalin. People naturally developed a sincere belief in the grandeur of Stalin's personality. And when the 20th party congress exploded like thunder, when the people learned what Stalin really was and how many illegalities and crimes he had committed, that was a shock. To bury the myth about Stalin, it was necessary to have a certain amount of courage, a certain level of morality. Unfortunately, many people have not parted company with this myth to this day.

One must also mention those who, in Stalin's time, wrote the denunciations on whose basis people were arrested, sent to camps, or executed. Today these people sense their complicity with Stalin and everything that was done then.

Correspondent: Is it true that you were also persecuted in the past?

Samsonov: I cannot say that I was persecuted. After the thaw of the sixties, there was a revival of Stalin's personality cult, a line of restoring his prestige was adopted. I myself maintained my own stance, and that is why I had constant difficulties with the publication of works which did not contain eulogies of either Stalin or Brezhnev. There were also difficulties arising from monopolism in military-historical science and the recognition of just one viewpoint. There was an occasion when I had to answer at a very high level questions concerning the publication of a book painting a critical picture of the initial period of the war. At that time I was working as director of the publishing house and was responsible for the book's publication. But I simply could not agree with the assessment of that book as being antiparty and having an anti-Soviet orientation. I did have unpleasant experiences....

Of course, people must know the truth, and historians must have an opportunity to freely express their point of view on facts and phenomena of the past. Such an opportunity is now available, and this is one of the supreme gains by democracy in the conditions of our society's restructuring. But the struggle between the new and old, including in the sphere of social sciences, continues.

Ligachev, Zaykov Visit Publishing House

LD0405143788 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, today visited the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA publishing house.

They met and talked with print workers and editorial staff. The need was stressed to speed up the construction of a new publishing building that would be fitted out with modern printing equipment and widely use electronic technology.

Ligachev and Zaykov had a business-like and substantive conversation with the senior executives of city newspapers. It was noted that the editorial staffs should direct their efforts at achieving specific changes for the better, at translating the creative energy of the people into practical work.

Special attention should be given to questions of using effectively the capital's powerful potential for accelerating scientific and technological progress and publicising advanced experience of transferring the economy to new conditions of management.

Real measures were required to improve the entire sphere of social services.

Rostov Aides Obstruct Afghan Memorial Event

PM0305130988 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 p 2

[Article written "on behalf of comrades" by I. Trubinkov, V. Titov, and G. Shcherbakov, chairmen of Rostov rayon councils of internationalist servicemen, under the "Keen Warning" rubric: "Local 'Battle'"]

[Text] Rostov-na-Donu—Rostov internationalist servicemen decided to hold a day of commemoration—a day of commemoration for our contemporaries who laid down their lives in performance of their duty—on 27 April, the 10th anniversary of the April revolution in Afghanistan. But instead we got a day of contempt for their memory, a day of hypocrisy.

We took the idea of a day of commemoration to the Komsomol gorkom at the beginning of April. Second Secretary S. Nikitenko was in full agreement with our proposals for assembling all the city's internationalist servicemen and inviting the parents of young men who died in Afghanistan and veterans of the Great Patriotic War to process together along Pushkin Street and lay wreaths on the tombs of our dead comrades. Sergey even added his own suggestion that a city rally be held and an invitation published in the press.

We began to get things ready. We decided to hold the assembly in Vita Cherevichkin Park, where we have premises, a kind of club. We sent out invitation cards, ordered the wreaths, and made all the arrangements

together with Komsomol workers. And then suddenly, with just over 1 week to go, everything came up against an invisible obstacle, as it were.

We do not know who precisely took exception to our initiative, we have not been informed. It was hinted that the party gorkom did not recommend that the demonstration take place. A tense atmosphere—echoes of the Nagorno-Karabakh events—allegedly existed in the city. Dubious elements might join in, disturbances were not excluded. Deputy Chief of the City Internal Affairs Administration I.N. Sukolenko explained that although Pushkin Street was a pedestrian precinct it would be necessary to block off crossroads and ensure the column's safety of movement—in short, more than enough work.

We, to be honest, were unpleasantly surprised by this, but did not argue. And then suddenly, with just days remaining we learned that "it is not recommended" either that a citywide assembly and rally be held. It is better that people be dispersed in their own rayons and that each hold its own meetings. We went to Gorispolkom Deputy Chairman N.P. Kuznetsov and began explaining that people had already been invited, everything was ready, and we all wanted to be together—we would be discussing together at the same time the idea of setting up a city council of internationalist servicemen, since it had been left hanging in the air for some time. Rayon councils are split up and their status is somewhat ill-defined and indeterminate. "No rallies, though meetings in rayons are allowed" was the severe response we received.

Throughout the remaining day we were "persuaded" in an organized and concerted way, both at our enterprises and the raykoms. And the workers at the Komsomol gorkom drastically changed their mind and also began persistently working on us. But when they learned that the young men would nevertheless be assembling, they proposed a compromise: We will add buses and drive to the cemetery for wreaths to be laid, but no rallies.

At 1645 on 27 April no more than 100 internationalist servicemen arrived at the park. And yet there are around 1,000 of us in the city. The invited veterans and families of the deceased arrived; and a whole army of Komsomol workers—raykom first secretaries and virtually the whole gorkom apparatus—came too. They were on their guard, immediately cutting off small groups and bundling them into buses. It was terribly shameful and painful—what kind of day of commemoration is it when we are treated like unreliable elements? Does it mean our Komsomol badges, party cards, orders, and medals do not count? Does it mean that when the motherland gave us weapons for us to perform our international duty we were trusted but now all that counts for nothing? After all, they dreamed up everything—they hastily painted the benches in the park on the day of the assembly, although the paint was quite fresh and bright. Even loud music—patriotic songs!—was laid on. We passed the evening as follows. People went to the cemetery by bus, laid wreaths, returned to the youth center, and there organized their own program and sang to guitar accompaniment. There were no disturbances. But nor was there the feeling with which we went to the meeting. We felt aggrieved and bewildered.

We were often asked at the time why we so wanted to meet together and join up. We explained that we consider it our duty to help the families of the deceased and invalid servicemen and to work together with young people. And another thing, we feel ourselves to be a real social force and seek to combat the shortcomings which exist in our society. Over there, in Afghanistan, we considered hypocrisy, cowardice, and fear for one's own well-being the gravest of sins. But on returning to our home city we saw that those very traits are all but the norm for many of our contemporaries in Komsomol committees as well as for somewhat older people. How other than by fear for his job can one explain the metamorphosis that occurred in S.S. Nikitenko, second secretary of the Komsomol gorkom? Why did no Komsomol workers pluck up the courage to go to the party gorkom to intercede for us, argue our case, and convince them?

At the time we often asked ourselves why they nevertheless allowed us to disperse? Allusions to disquiet in the city are very stupid. Perhaps the whole point is that some people harbor shameful doubts about us? But we are firm in the knowledge that thousands of our contemporaries have honorably performed their duty, and there is nothing with which to reproach us.

Baku Notes May Day, Soviet Sovereignty Date

NC0405074288 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 28 Apr 88

[Text] The Baku City Soviet held a jubilant meeting in Lenin's Palace this evening on the occasion of the 68th anniversary of Soviet sovereignty over Azerbaijan and on the occasion of 1 May. Kyamran Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; other party and government officials of the Republic and party; war, and work veterans; production officials; generals and admirals; and scientists and cultural officials, sat in the chairmanship council of the meeting.

Baku Gorispolkom Chairman Oktay Zeynalov opened the jubilant meeting, after which the national anthems of the Soviet Union and the Azerbaijan SSR were played. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Mikhail Gorbachev was elected to the chairmanship council with loud applause. Telman Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, read a report. A concert also was given for the participants of the meeting on the occasion of the jubilant anniversary. The Republic's radio and television networks carried the jubilant meeting and concert, which

were dedicated to the 68th anniversary of Soviet sovereignty over Azerbaijan and to 1 May, the international solidarity day of the workers.

Historians, Writers Conference Speeches Viewed

PM021559 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Truth About History, Truth About Life. Conference of Historians and Writers"]

[Text] Two powerful streams of truth—historical truth and artistic truth—must, without fail, become a reliable guarantee of the irreversibility of the changes which are now taking place in the country and provide a powerful ideological backup for the process of the democratization of Soviet society. Such is the underlying meaning of the sharp and constructive discussion which took place at the conference of historians and writers that ended 28 April. The meeting was organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Writers' Union, and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

In the opinion of all the conference's participants, the expanding explosion of readers' interest in historical literature and fiction has placed a tremendous burden of responsibility on the shoulders of writers and historians. However, while the former find themselves in the forefront at this revolutionary turning point and have become beacons, as it were, pointing the way in shaping public opinion, historians, to our bitter disappointment, have proved unable to submit honest and lucid works for people's assessment, A. Iskenderov, chief editor of VOPROSY ISTORII, said.

What does our historical knowledge consist of today? Many of the discussion's participants asked themselves this—at first glance, theoretical—question. It is, however, a question which affects our day-to-day life, our comprehensive renewal, Doctor of Historical Sciences Yu. Afanasyev said.

So far we have been living through a time not of creating the history of socialism, but of glimpsing it, glimpsing it fragmentarily and avidly, since this is the first time that the people have been able to read the text of their own autobiography for themselves, writer O. Poptsov said, developing the idea.

Both, writers and historians correctly noted at the meeting that the years of stagnation put the seal of drabness on historical science, literature, and art alike. However, it would be the gravest of sins and an enormous injustice to hurl brickbats at the great literature which was born on the wave of the 20th CPSU Congress in the sixties and seventies, F. Kuznetsov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences declared.

S. Zalygin, chief editor of NOVYY MIR, noted that literature and history are close because they are both based on such incontrovertible values as interest in the individual and interest in mankind as a whole. If serious literary creation is under way today, the writer stressed, this in itself is of historic significance, because it contains the germ which will, in time, become an asset of history. However, this does not mean that history dictates its rules to literature. An artist can only be dictated to by his talent and his civic conscience.

The problem of the struggle between the old and the new thinking was discussed actively and with great interest at the conference. At times, literary critic V. Oskotskiy said, the old thinking is countering new thinking with militancy and aggressiveness. Some newspaper and journal articles bear this out. The old way of thinking is reflected in remarks on the lines of "no one in the world runs down their history as we do." However, the voice of the "defenders of the foundations" rang out most clearly and loudly in the article by N. Andreyeva entitled "I Cannot Waive My Principles."

Many speakers noted with satisfaction that these anti-restructuring tendencies were rebutted in a worthy and authoritative fashion. However, M. Shatrov asked, was it really necessary for us who are taking part in this conference to wait until 5 April to express our own viewpoint? Where were the historians and social scientists who had sworn allegiance to restructuring? In this hall we, historians and writers, are holding out our hands toward each other. It is important to ensure that these hands do not remain just suspended in the air.

The fate of restructuring, in the view of poet V. Kostrov, will depend on which processes prevail in social life. Most people understand that there is no alternative to the proposals formulated by the party, that there is no alternative to democratization.

Questions pertaining to the Stalin personality cult, its causes, and serious consequences featured in most speeches in one way or another. Is the term "Stalinism" justified? D. Volkonogov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Military History, answered this question in the affirmative, pointing out that it was a question of a crude distortion of Lenin's ideas about socialism, of a far from full utilization of the material and spiritual potential of the new system and the human factor, and of inflicting wounds on society which have not healed to this day.

The origins of the negative processes to which we refer as "stagnation" today date back precisely to that period, N. Shundik, secretary of the RSFSR Writers' Union, stressed. In this context, according to the writer's words, it is necessary to remember that the people's feats both in labor and in the struggle against fascism were achieved despite, rather than thanks to, everything that was spawned by Stalinism. It is impermissible to liken post-October generations to infusorians that obeyed the will "of the leader of nations." Leninism existed even then as a real spiritual force, and it was this force which motivated millions of Soviet people at that time.

However, in the opinion of most of the participants in the discussion, this understanding does not do away with the need to reread many pages of our history from a new angle, attentively and honestly, and to overcome the one-sided depiction of many of its facts. Alarm at the inadequate depiction of the events of the Great Fatherland War and of the turning points and dramatic events of history was expressed by writer V. Astafyev, literary critic A. Lanshchikov, and other speakers.

It is known that work has begun on one such publication, "The History of the Soviet People's Great Fatherland War." However, one of the speakers noted, the scientific community at large was not involved in the elaboration of the concept and the structural plan of this fundamental work. Here too, the bureaucratic, administrative approach made itself felt, and this is absolutely impermissible in an atmosphere of revived interest in history.

The concluding speech was delivered by P. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Aviation Official on Hijacking, Countermeasures

PM0405152788 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with I.F. Vasin, USSR deputy minister of civil aviation, by S. Karkhanin: "We Want To Be Sure—I.F. Vasin, USSR Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation, Comments on Readers' Letters After the Tragic Flight"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] During the 6 weeks since that tragic day at an airfield near Leningrad the editorial office has received hundreds of responses to the series of articles "Interrupted Flight," "5 Hours of Anxiety," and "Tamara Zharkaya Street." People are truly perturbed by the gangsters' attempt to hijack an aircraft traveling from Irkutsk to the city on the Neva. "I am convinced that the terrorists who survived will get what they deserve in court," V. Loginov, a fitter from Orel, writes. "The death of the stewardess and several passengers is on their conscience." All readers are unanimous about this.

But the letters also contain questions. The majority of them are about the actions of the Aeroflot services during those tragic hours when the armed gangsters committed excesses on board the airliner.

[Karkhanin] Ivan Fedotovich, in the readers' pointed questions we are putting to you there is, in my view, no bias or desire to unfailingly place Aeroflot in the worst possible light. But, you will agree, people's concern is understandable. First, it proved impossible to prevent the hijack attempt without bloodshed. Second, any person might be a airline passenger, and he or she wants to be sure that the safety of the flight is ensured... Have your services really done everything in their power to this end?

[Vasin] We are also preoccupied with this. After the emergency near Leningrad we in the ministry also received many letters.

"Possibly, the bloodshed could have been avoided if the terrorists' demands had been met and the aircraft had flown if not to London then to some nearby foreign airport. Why was a different decision made?" A. Proshin from Volgograd writes.

[Vasin] Some newspapers also suggested this... But it is not as simple as it might seem. Let us look at it from a professional standpoint. The crews of international passenger airlines who fly on international routes undergo special training precisely for this difficult work, and they must know English to communicate with foreign controller services. For an international flight, aircraft must also carry on board special aeronavigational documents, and before each flight the crew members study all the specific features of the route, including the location of radio ground support facilities and air corridors, flight level separation, and many other factors. Naturally, none of this existed for the Tu-154 crew working on internal routes. Of course, as far as this flight is concerned the decision to land in the Leningrad region was also influenced by the fact that the aircraft had a limited fuel supply. If it had lasted out even as far as the nearest foreign airport there was no guarantee of a safe outcome to the flight because the fuel would be low and would even be insufficient for the landing approach. The weather that day in the Leningrad area and over Finland had deteriorated sharply because of snow. Runways were blocked with snow. In such instances the possibility of repeated landing approaches is not excluded. It is virtually impossible to land an aircraft at an unfamiliar airfield, without the necessary documentation and knowledge of English, in poor visibility, and if your fuel is running low.

This is why I believe that, by ensuring the airliner a safe landing on Soviet territory, the ground services and crew acted in the interests of the passengers and their safety—that is, correctly. The crew and the stewards did everything within their power—they did not allow the incident to develop while the aircraft was in the air. It was precisely at that time that the danger was most acute: The unpredictable behavior of the gangsters could have led to them carry out their threat—to destroy the aircraft with their explosive device before landing.

"Is it possible that Aeroflot operates some kind of instruction by which crews of Soviet aircraft are directed not to cross the USSR state border, even if the hijackers demand this and threaten to kill the passengers?" Muscovite I. Samokhvalov wonders.

[Vasin] Of course, we have many instructions, they all have a particular purpose, but there is not one like this. Our instructions accord with the standard recommendations of the International Civil Aviation Organization based on concern for passenger safety, and it is precisely

this concern which determines the decisions made in whatever circumstances. In this particular case the aircraft captain, taking into consideration the factors I mentioned in response to the preceding question, decided not to cross the border. In other words, as an experienced pilot he was guided not by someone else's or by his own hardheaded obstinacy but by a reasonable assessment of the specific situation and by the results of an analysis of the evolving circumstances.

[Karkhanin] There are some letters which express bewilderment regarding the crew's actions after landing. "The stewardesses carried the main burden of the psychological duel with the hijackers. Couldn't the four strong male pilots, who were even armed, have been more active in assisting the stewardesses in the cabin?" N. Gribanova from Voronezh asks.

[Vasin] First, the crew was not idle. As is known, the flight engineer went out of the cockpit twice on the captain's instruction to talk with the gangsters to persuade them to negotiate and reach a reasonable solution. The captain talked with them for a long time over the telephone. Both tried to resolve their main task—averting bloodshed. Incidentally, the stewardesses say that the flight engineer calmed the terrorists and helped to stabilize the situation on board. But if, let's say, the crew had begun firing, goodness knows how many people would have been killed—by bullets or an explosion. And then, under no circumstances should the hijackers be allowed to fight their way into the cockpit. This could have led to unforeseen consequences, and possibly even more serious ones. It is no accident that the Ovechkins tried so persistently to open the cockpit door. They realized that if they could get in there, their whole mad and unpredictable venture would have the chance to succeed...

[Karkhanin] A former Leningrad pilot, V. Tomilin, is interested in how the crew of the Tu-154 and the stewardesses are faring now.

[Vasin] They are all fine and have gone back to work. The Irkutsk airline was sensitive and attentive in its treatment of the people who experienced these tragic events.

Incidentally, I shall digress for a moment. From a purely human standpoint I still do not understand what forced the Ovechkins to set out on this bloody path. If they believed that life abroad was free and easy for such people as themselves, then they could have used the normal, established procedure to put the question of leaving for permanent residence abroad. I don't think anyone would have stopped them... Especially since not a single country favors hijackers. For example, judging by the Turkish authorities' official reports, the Brazinskas father and son—the murderers of stewardess Nadezhda Kurchenko—were sentenced to several years' imprisonment there.

[Karkhanin] Incidentally, questions of states' international agreements on combating air piracy are also contained in readers' letters. "Are such agreements working effectively? Why do criminals believe that if they succeed in hijacking an aircraft to a foreign country they will not be punished?" P. Gerasimenko from Orenburg is interested to know.

[Vasin] I must say that our country is striving most vigorously to make punishment for hijacking inevitable. The proposals which we are constantly making to international organizations are also aimed at this. By the way, we are still demanding the extradition of the Brazinskas to face Soviet justice.

According to accepted international conventions, persons who have hijacked an aircraft are to be extradited or to face charges to the full extent of criminal liability according to states' national legislation.

[Karkhanin] B. Klimenko of Chita, N. Pashkevich from Zagorsk, and many others are alarmed at the fact that the Ovechkins managed to take weapons on board the aircraft. "So the system of preflight inspection in the special control zones at airports is defective," the readers write. "Decisive measures are needed, otherwise passengers will not feel safe." One person writing from Voronezh offers an experiment: I can, he says, take large metal objects onto an aircraft at any airport—and no one suspects me.

[Vasin] He cannot be serious. Regarding the other readers' concern, this is fully justified. As already reported in the press, the Ovechkins hid sawed-off shotguns inside a double bass which was too big for the scanning machine. I think the appropriate assessment will be made of the carelessness of those who carried out the inspection. And regarding measures, they have been taken, of course, and preflight monitoring has been tightened up. Although, I must say, the passengers do not always understand us in these situations. They rightly ask for checking to be stricter, and at the same time when they themselves are in the inspection zone they are offended by what they think is "excessive" strictness. I shall add that additional measures of an organizational and technical nature are being taken to increase the effectiveness of preflight inspection of passengers and their baggage.

[Karkhanin] And lastly, Ivan Fedotovich. What lessons has Aeroflot drawn from the tragedy at Leningrad?

[Vasin] The investigation will sort everything out and will provide an assessment of the actions of those who were involved in the events. But where purely professional factors connected with Aeroflot's work are concerned, a lot is already clear now. I do not want my answers to be interpreted as attempts to shield my department. Of course, we are drawing conclusions from the criticisms made of us contained in the letters sent to the newspaper's editorial office and our ministry. I have

already mentioned some of them in answering the preceding questions. Nonetheless, I repeat that stepping up passenger flight safety will remain our immediate task. Especially as preventing aircraft hijack attempts is now very important for all countries. The recent dramatic events connected with the seizure of the Kuwaiti Boeing, which were disturbing for people throughout the world, are yet one more proof of this.

Silence on Air Crash Findings Criticized

PM281537 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report under the "Science: Enquiry and Problems" rubric: "After Criticism: 'The Price of the Truth'"]

[Text] I. Mashkivskiy, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Aircraft Flight Safety [Gosavianadzor], has replied to the PRAVDA article entitled "The Price of the Truth" (15 June 87), which particularly criticized the Ministry of Civil Aviation decision on the results of the inquiry into the crash of a Tu-154 in the region of the population center of Uch-Kuduk on 10 July. In his response to the editorial office the USSR Gosavianadzor chairman reports as follows:

"The inquiry into the aforementioned aviation incident was carried out by a commission of the USSR Gosavianadzor headed by Comrade I.F. Vasin, deputy minister of civil aviation (until 1986 the Gosavianadzor came under the minister of civil aviation). A document on the results of the inquiry was ratified on 23 September 1985.

"The inquiry evidence was examined, on the CPSU Central Committee's instruction, by scientific research organizations belonging to the USSR Ministry of Aviation, the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Defense. The expert testimony was presented in October 1985.

"Analysis of the evidence showed that the inquiry into the disaster had been carried out unobjectively and that the cause of the accident, which was due to serious shortcomings in the organization, backup, and execution of the flight, had not been disclosed. In the opinion of the USSR Gosavianadzor, there is no connection between the additional restrictions on cruising altitudes for Tu-154 flights unilaterally introduced by the Ministry of Civil Aviation and the cause of the aircraft disaster, nor does this follow from the results of the inquiry.

"I can report in addition that the USSR Gosavianadzor fully shares the editorial office's view on the need for closer cooperation with organs of the press and will be taking appropriate measures to publish prompt, objective information on questions of flight safety."

The editorial office draws attention to the fact that, despite such a clear assessment, backed up by the conclusions of expert witnesses, the Ministry of Civil Aviation has not changed its stance, which leads, in the opinion of specialists, to the unjustified overconsumption of hundreds of tonnes of aviation fuel. The tacit consent here of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, which has drawn no conclusions on this question, despite the findings of its inquiry, is also surprising.

Economic

Deputy Premier Antonov Meets Enterprise Chiefs

PM291325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "New Forms of Integration"]

[Text] A conference of directors of a number of enterprises, associations, and organizations and leaders of central economic and sectoral ministries and departments was held at the USSR Council of Ministers on 25 April to discuss measures to develop new integrational forms of cooperation with partners in the socialist countries.

The leaders of enterprises in the automotive, machine tool building, light, chemical, timber, electrical equipment, instrument making, and other industrial sectors exchanged experiences in work developing direct production and scientific-technical links.

A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.K. Rybakov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; and senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers apparatuses participated in the conference's work.

Cooperatives Part of 'Profound' Transformations

PM0405133588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Communists and the Cooperative System: The Cause Needs Enterprising People"]

[Text] There is perhaps no other single innovative idea of restructuring which causes some minds such dismay and confusion as the idea of the cooperative system. What labels some people pin on cooperative members, what charges they level at them! This even befalls Communists who have clearly defined their attitude to the cooperative system and who are doing their utmost to ensure that it develops as rapidly as possible into a mighty creative force for us.

"Restructuring is enmeshing the country in a web of cooperatives. They are sucking money out of Soviet people and even organizing party groups. Private stores are anathema to the Communist, if he be a Leninist Communist."

As you can see, just a few lines but what mental aggression and confusion they contain! However, such outright declarations in the editorial mailbag are nevertheless the exception. There are rather more disclosures of a different kind on this score—ironic or humorous ones. Thus you see the real face of the writers who dislike innovation.

How are things with these people? On the one hand they want a fine life but no one is going to offer it to them on a silver platter. But there are no miracles. It is only in fairy tales that you wave a magic wand and there suddenly appear white stone palaces and food-laden tables which are constantly replenished.

However, on the subject of letters to PRAVDA it must be said right away that the vast majority of them actively support restructuring. We have 3 years' experience of searching for innovation. We now have a program of profound transformations and have begun to implement it. Not without success. The seeds of restructuring are already bearing rich fruit. Man is standing tall, his energy is being released. The time has come when everyone can take his rightful place in society and show his worth in all spheres of its life and activity.

The cooperative movement is a weighty argument for that. In just 1 year almost 14,000 cooperatives have been created and have begun operating in the country; the number of cooperatives has increased tenfold. They have produced goods and services worth no less than R350 million.

Let us think back to the past. It was with the help of the cooperative system in the twenties that the country managed more quickly to overcome hunger and devastation after the civil war. Many forms of cooperation developed rapidly at that time. Subsequently, however, Lenin's ideas on the cooperative system began to be seriously diluted and distorted. Even the kolkhozes essentially ceased to be cooperatives and were turned into collectives where commands from above were carried out unthinkingly.

Today we are returning to the teaching on the socialist cooperative system—one of Lenin's most brilliant innovations. We are doing so in light of the new conditions and new demands, of course. We are recreating the cooperative system not in its old and often extremely simple forms but a modern and high standard cooperative system with a variety of specializations. The kind which could help us to better satisfy our increased and very diverse needs, to seek out extra material resources, and to establish reciprocal relations between large, medium, and small enterprises. There is another important feature. The cooperative system will make it possible to employ all strata of the population including those in small towns, settlements, and the countryside. It will increase families' incomes and replenish local social development budgets.

We now have 150,000 people working in cooperatives. For a country as huge as ours that is, to be blunt, a drop in the bucket. Why are there so few? The development of the cooperative system has been seriously hampered by deficiencies in the law. Hence people's excessive caution. Nevertheless, there have been some trailblazers. They were undoubtedly the really daring ones and we will thank them one day. In actual fact we already have. The results of their trial-and-error method were taken into account in the innovative document, the draft Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR," which is now being discussed with great interest in the country. That is no coincidence. In terms of its social importance this draft may stand comparison with such revolutionary acts in our economy as the decision on free trade and on the rigorous food tax [prodnalog] adopted in the spring of 1921 which essentially saved the country from the imminent internal crisis at that time.

M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the Fourth All-Union Congress of Kolkhoz Members and the draft law posed the cooperative question in a principled way: The cooperative system must be organically incorporated into the radical economic reform that is in progress and must be a reliable instrument for improvement in the national economy. It follows from this that it is necessary for us all, in particular for soviet ispolkoms and party committees, to resolutely eliminate the outmoded stereotyped thinking and actions and change the attitude toward the cooperative system as something second-rate and of little significance. That attitude is still making its presence felt.

At the moment the contribution made by cooperative members in, for example, the Buryat ASSR remains very, very modest. There is a direct link between shortcomings in satisfying the population's needs and the sluggish and indifferent stance of the autonomous republic's leaders. Many of them habitually cling to the principle of "what I say goes" and bear no responsibility morally even less materially for the consequences of their decisions. The peremptory tone and the unthinking prohibitions stifle people's initiative. Many letters make that point.

The response in Latvia is quite different. In Riga alone dozens of cooperatives have been set up providing medical and consumer services, producing consumer goods, and repairing and building housing. The cooperative process is progressing actively in Moscow Oblast. In Noginsk, for example, the "Vympel" cooperative headed by Yu. Kamenetskiy has won a high reputation. The sewn goods produced by the cooperative's enthusiastic members are selling well in 13 large department stores in the capital and in the "Detskiy Mir" store. There are almost 1,500 cooperatives working in the Moscow region now. The range of their activity is virtually limitless. In Minsk, too, they are not waiting for further instructions from above. On the party gorkom's initiative a clear program for the development of the cooperative system has been devised there. In all rayons

in the city there are regular cooperative days and training is organized for chairmen and accountants. A characteristic feature is that many Communists are cooperative members and leaders. The gorkom rightly believes that this is a good thing! The Communist in the cooperative is the guarantee that wages will be sensible and prices for output reasonable.

Letter writers from Aktyubinsk express gratitude to A. Merzlyakov, chairman of a cooperative under the "Aktyubrentgen" Association and a Communist and retired officer, and those from Ufa express gratitude to Dr. R. Afanasenko, head of the "Tonus" physical culture and health cooperative. In short, cooperatives are becoming a firm part of our life.

Nevertheless, on the whole the cooperative movement is still developing slowly and unevenly. You get the impression that in some places they simply do not have the ability to transform the party's line into a system of concrete measures. Why? you ask. Yes, the force of inertia is a brake and undue caution and administrative and command-based methods are a hindrance. It may be said that they have penetrated the flesh and blood of some leaders.

Only fresh minds, unspent strength, and high moral principles can advance our economic practice and elevate the cooperative system to a broad highway of prosperity. Capable and worthy people must be drawn into the new venture more quickly. The struggle for the cooperative system is essentially only just beginning. Whether it remains the ugly duckling of our economy or grows into a beautiful swan depends on all of us, on our social and political activeness, and on our ability to see things through to the end. The task is clear: We must make the cooperative system a permanent part of the arsenal of the mighty means of socialist building. It is worth it.

Rubber Plant Shut on Environmental Grounds

PM250937 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 9 Apr 88 p 1

[ARMENPRESS report: "In the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers; On Closing the Obsolete 'Kauchuk-1' Chloroprene Rubber Facility"]

[Text] In accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers 11 December 1987 resolution "On Additional Measures To Improve the Ecological Situation in Yerevan," the protocol of a joint session of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry held 8-10 February 1988, and also a USSR Council of Ministers 2 April 1988 instruction, the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium adopted a decision 29 April 1988 to close the remaining two technological production lines and the entire obsolete "Kauchuk-1" chloroprene rubber manufacturing works and consequently reduce output and deliveries in 1988.

The Council of Ministers instructed the "Nairit" scientific production association to submit a proposal on utilizing the vacated production premises for producing popular consumer goods.

At the same time the "Nairit" scientific production association is instructed to take additional measures to ensure that the measures envisaged to improve the ecological situation are rigorously fulfilled.

Agricultural

Gales in Kirghizia Cause 'Substantial Damage'

LD0405101288 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Frunze May 4 TASS—Gale-force winds, torrential downpours and lashing hail swept the Chuya Valley in the Soviet Central Asian Republic of Kirghizia last night, damaging power transmission lines and old buildings and felling trees in some areas.

Agriculture in the valley suffered substantial damage.

Local authorities marshalled machines to clear roads and organized other work to deal with the consequences of the storm.

Considerable Flooding Affects Azerbaijan Farms

LD0405131988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] The thaw and prolonged heavy rain which have occurred throughout the territory of Azerbaijan have caused a sharp rise in the level of water in the rivers Kura and Araks. As a result, a considerable area of farmland has been flooded in a number of areas in the republic. Sabirabadskiy Rayon has suffered particularly. More than 20,000 hectares of grains, cottons, and fodder crops ended up under water. A considerable area of fruit orchards has been flooded, and public sector stockbreeding has suffered. Thanks to urgent steps adopted by party and economic bodies of the rayon, more than 250 families have been evacuated from the flood zone, and the victims are being rendered the necessary aid. Fortunately, there proved to be no casualties. A headquarters to clear up the aftermath of the natural disaster has been set up Sabirabad. Dikes are being built along the river, and pumping stations are being set up.

Further on Nikonov's Krasnodar Kray Tour

PM0305113188 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 24 Apr 88 p 2

[TASS report: "Kuban: Scientific Potential—For the Agro-Industrial Complex"]

[Text] In the Kuban the peasants' cares have always been close to the hearts and minds of every working person. Spring hopes for a stable, abundant harvest in the kray are being pinned this year on a sharp increase in the

efficiency with which the the potential in all sectors of the agro-industrial complex is utilized. A realistic path toward this consists of stepping up scientific and technical progress in all spheres of the agro-industrial complex, and equipping as quickly as possible kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and processing enterprises with the latest achievements of science and advanced practice.

During the visit to Krasnodar Kray 20-23 April by V.P. Nikonov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, attention was mainly directed toward questions of radically restructuring the scientific backup of agro-industrial production. He became acquainted with the work of scientific research institutes, VUZ's, experimental stations, and planning and design organizations, and visited farms and enterprises in the food and processing industry.

The activity of the recently created center providing scientific backup for the kray's agro-industrial production, which comprises 45 scientific organizations under diverse departmental jurisdiction, was analyzed in detail. In conversations with kray scientists, specialists, and leaders it was noted that scientific research and training establishments have still not become genuine centers for developing and introducing scientifically valid zonal systems for conducting agriculture, nor for new progressive technologies for the processing sectors. Efforts by scientists, and material and financial resources are not sufficiently concentrated in the leading areas, and there are instances of duplication and parallelism. The range of topics in scientific departments often does not accord with the problems of the kray's agro-industrial complex. Some of these departments are concerned only with modernizing the existing technology instead of searching for fundamentally new solutions. Heretofore the organization of introductory work has been the most laggard field.

Problems pertaining to the cultivation of high-yield, reliable, and stable strains of winter cereals, biochemical methods for controlling plant pests, and the main areas for improving the organization and stimulation of selection work were discussed at the P.P. Lukyanenko Agricultural Scientific Research Institute in the Kuban which produced the "Bezostaya 1" strain of wheat renowned throughout the world. In the institute's experimental field the CPSU Central Committee secretary viewed the trial plots of new strains of durum and strong wheats, and sowings of early ripening barley and triticale that are promising for the kray.

During his visit to the scientific centers and laboratories of the All-Union Rice Scientific Research Institute and the Kirov Kolkhoz in Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, questions of increasing the production of the valuable hulled crop were examined, as were measures to disseminate advanced technologies widely. It was noted that science-and-production systems and production systems, experimental production farms and base farms operating on a contractual basis must play an important role in assimilating completed scientific developments in all sectors of the agro-industrial complex.

Emphasis was placed on the necessity to create as quickly as possible directly at the farms themselves an effective system for the introduction of developments by scientists who should be the closest assistants of the leaders of links and teams and of the leaders of contracting and lease collectives. To improve the level to which the countryside is technically equipped wider use should be made of the capacities of the major machine-building plants situated in the Kuban and also of the potential of the enterprises and workshops of the kray's agro-industrial complex.

The country's first agro-industrial combine the "Kuban," has been operating in Timashevskiy Rayon for almost 4 years. It became the prototype for new organizational formations in the agro-industrial complex permitting a close integration of production, processing, storage, and sale of agricultural output. Acquainting himself with the combine's experience and problems, V.P. Nikonov drew attention to the need to make more efficient use of the "Kuban's" potential to improve the supply of diverse high-quality foodstuffs to the population through the thorough processing of livestock products on the basis of advanced technology and the latest equipment.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited farms which are part of the combine. At the construction complex for enterprises involved in the food and processing industry and in packaging he talked with Yugoslav workers and specialists who are building these facilities in accordance with a contract with the agricultural combine.

At the Adygeyskiy Canning Combine and at the Krasnodar Oils and Fats Combine the tasks of utilizing advanced technologies and highly-productive modern equipment, and the active involvement of scientific establishments in developing these production facilities, were discussed. It was stressed that, in addition to utilizing major plants, small food industry enterprises should be developed directly on kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

In conversation with working people at the Kirov Kolkhoz in Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, the particulars of switching all economic subdivisions to the principles of self-financing and self-capitalization were discussed. It was noted that economics still owes a lot to rural workers, and scientists are not devoting sufficient attention to developing the basics of economically accountable relations, and the implementation of advanced forms of labor remuneration.

In Kanevskiy Rayon the CPSU Central Committee secretary became acquainted with the Kuban's waste-free technology for grain threshing at the Kalinin Kolkhoz,

with the work of the Staroderevyankovskiy Agricultural Procurement, Industrial and Trade Cooperative, with the organization of labor in the lease collective of the dairy livestock unit at the Sverdlov Kolkhoz, and with the "Victory" Kolkhoz' agro-chemical complex. During meetings with the inhabitants of the kray's villages and farms, questions were raised about accelerating the village's social development, and expanding the forms of the cooperative movement.

V.P. Nikonov laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Memorial in Krasnodar.

A meeting with the party and economic aktiv, and with scientists and specialists of the kray's agro-industrial complex took place in the party kraykom, at which measures were determined to accelerate the restructuring of the scientific backup for the Kuban's agro-industrial complex, and to step up the region's contribution to fulfilling the Food Program.

I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar party kraykom, and N.I. Kondratenko, chairman of the kray ispolkom, accompanied V.P. Nikonov.

Scientific

Marchuk Remarks on 'New Age' in Soviet Science

PM291159 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 21 Apr 88 p 22

[Erik Wahlstrom report: "Perestroyka Also Affects Research]

[Text] Air pollution on the Kola Peninsula which also affects the countryside of Finnish Lapland.

The closed Soviet archives.

Perestroyka's effect on scientific cooperation with foreign countries.

These were some of the questions put to Soviet Academy President G.Ya. Marchuk after his lecture at Helsinki University yesterday on the new age in Soviet science.

Marchuk has led a delegation that has been holding talks about scientific cooperation between the Soviet and Finnish academies. A memorandum on how this cooperation should be developed was signed Tuesday [19 April] by Marchuk and Finnish Academy Central Scientific Commission chairman, Professor Erik Allardt. At present there are 35 joint scientific research projects in progress, and an exchange of researchers which amounts to 50 working months per year. From next year, this will be increased to 60 working months.

The Soviet delegation proposed new research projects in, for example, the Arctic region and the legal field.

According to Allardt, the Finnish academy agrees with the proposals for this cooperation. The only thing we do not yet have in these fields are researchers and money.

The Finnish academy has also begun to work as a mediator for contacts with Finnish companies, which could form joint companies with Soviet enterprises in areas of interest to the academy.

According to Marchuk, perestroyka means that the principles of profitability and accountability [resultatansvarighet] have also been extended to scientific institutions. The sluggish centrally-run machinery is being demolished. Individual institutions have, for example, been given the right to establish contacts themselves with their foreign counterparts, instead of having to go through the central institutions as now. The central academies only step in and help if necessary.

In his review of what scientific fields are of interest in the Soviet Union today, Marchuk mentioned AIDS research, for example, and said that there has been great ignorance about the fact that such research is being pursued in the Soviet Union on a larger scale than previously believed. According to Marchuk, researchers have produced a drug, Akydotimed, which prolongs the lives of AIDS patients.

Otherwise, Marchuk's list of strong scientific fields in the Soviet Union was largely the well-known list, headed by space research.

Naturally, ecological problems are in the foreground in the Soviet Union, as elsewhere. As an example of applied research, Marchuk mentioned that a TU-155 aircraft recently had a test flight with a cryogenic motor using liquid hydrogen, an ecologically clean fuel.

But on the Kola Peninsula the nickel mines give out heavy metals and sulfur dioxide, and the traces of these can be clearly seen on the Nordic maps of Lapland.

Marchuk said that this problem, like the Leningrad barrage, the evaporation of the Aral Sea, and others, has been discussed often and openly "and sometimes also with exaggeration" in the Soviet press. Assessing the ecological effects of these industries and projects has high priority in today's research programs.

"And how do things stand with the Soviet historical archives?" one journalist asked. "Can foreign historians look forward to being allowed to research in the archives from the fifties, or from the time of the bourgeois republics in the Baltic states?"

There was no direct reply to this question—or if there was, it did not get as far as the Finnish translation. Marchuk contented himself with saying that there is

great interest in the Soviet Union in everything to do with all blank spots in recent Soviet history, and that controversial historical questions are being discussed freely.

Sagdeyev Speaks at Meeting on Space Cooperation
LD0405084088 Moscow TASS in English 0806 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Washington May 4 TASS—TASS correspondent A. Berezhkov reports:

"Cooperation in Space: Ways Further To Develop It" is the name of a Soviet-U.S. meeting on problems of collaborative efforts in the field of space exploration held in the building of the U.S. Congress. Among those who attended the meeting were Academician R. Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Carl Sagan, director of the Laboratory of Planetary Society. The scientists spoke about cooperation of the two countries' specialists in space exploration, the vistas being opened for science by the pooling of their efforts in accomplishing specific tasks of space science.

The situation in the world today differs drastically from the one that prevailed at the dawn of the mastering of space. Our countries do not need now to demonstrate their strategic might, the capacity to destroy each other. We are required quite the opposite: to demonstrate the ability to work together. The American scientist emphasized that he had a chance to see for himself that there is strong interest in the USSR in cooperation in peaceful space exploration.

Sagdeyev noted the importance of continued work in partnership to tackle the most involved scientific and technological problems in the study of space. He stressed that the policy of openness and the process of restructuring under way in the USSR envisioned exactly such coooperation.

The USSR plans to send an automatic inter-planetary station to Mars in 1994, the Soviet scientist said. We also intend to land on the surface of this planet an automatic rover. This will require the development of fundamentally new equipment. Truly ample opportunities are being opened here for increasing international cooperation on a competitive basis, Sagdeyev said. He called for pooling knowledge and expertise of scientists in various countries, among them in the USSR and the United States, in exploring space and extending contacts in the process of implementing the space programmes of our countries.

Comparison of 'Mir' Cosmonauts' Activities

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 4 May carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a TASS report on Mir activities. The PRAVDA report, "News From Orbit," has been compared with the TASS English version published in the 3 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 56, revealing the following variations:

Column one, last paragraph, last line reads in PRAVDA: ...is proceeding normally. The parameters of its orbit are currently these:

Maximum distance from the earth's surface—366 km;

Minimum distance from the earth's surface—340 km;

Orbital period—91.4 minutes;

Inclination—51.6°. (adding passage)

Military

Workers, Servicemen Learn Lessons From Chernobyl
PM0505093588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 First Edition p 2

[Article by Lieutenant General A. Kuntsevich under the "Emergency Situation: People, Science, Equipment" rubric: "Returning to Those Days"—first two paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Excerpts] The night of 26 April 1986... The explosion at the Chernobyl AES, the 2 years of selfless, heroic labor by workers and servicemen, engineers and scientists, power engineers, chemical industry workers, construction workers, doctors...

Yes, we have learned a lot in this difficult period, we have understood and rethought a lot. It is for a reason they say that adverse experience, even if it is sorry experience, is still experience. What does it provide from the position of today and tomorrow? What is the role and place of scientists, including military scientists, in resolving the problems brought to light by Chernobyl? These points are considered by Academician and Hero of Socialist Labor Lieutenant General A. Kuntsevich, deputy chief of the USSR Defense Ministry chemical troops.

What happened in Chernobyl alarmed many people. Not only in our country. That is understandable. An emergency situation of extraordinary complexity and danger was created. To anticipate, I will say that the events at the Chernobyl AES gave rise to pessimistic feelings not only regarding the widespread use of new types of energy but also regarding highly progressive but at the same time potentially dangerous technologies, chemical technologies, for instance. But, after all, scientific and technical progress cannot be halted, it is an objective reality and an essential condition of society's development. [passage omitted]

Today, 2 years later, it may confidently be said that the strategy of Soviet science, the strategy of leadership of all echelons and organs of the troops and indeed of the entire complex multilevel mechanism created here have fully justified themselves. Three of the station's units are functioning normally, one of them is undergoing scheduled maintenance [vyveden na planovyye reglamentnyye raboty] and the fourth unit is inside a reliable "covering." The duty men—AES workers, construction workers, and scientists—are living in Chernobyl and Pripyat. Hundreds of population centers have been decontaminated and water protection measures have prevented the pollution of the water of the Dnepr basin while dozens of kilometers of new roads have been built. The air environment, under constant observation, is giving no cause for alarm. We know that what must be done now and what must be done within a week, a month, or 6 months. Naturally the servicemen's degree of participation in this work will decline with time.

Many lessons and conclusions have been acquired for theory and practice. Including by us professional military men. It is indisputable that even modern conventional warfare with the enemy's use of high-precision weapons, given the modern level of development of peaceful atomic engineering and wide-scale chemical production facilities with potentially dangerous chemicals, would have serious consequences connected with radiation or chemical pollution. Readiness to fight and work under these extreme conditions should be as great as possible.

It is also important to realize that even now we are dealing with extraordinarily complex equipment. This equipment will become even more complex tomorrow. Automata, computers, analysis and memory units, and so forth undoubtedly facilitate the operator's work and decision-making but they do not exclude man and do not belittle his role. Chernobyl showed this most convincingly.

Of itself this is not a new idea. Why am I focusing attention on it? Today special institutes and sociological research centers are being created to study man's problems. But an analysis of the published materials shows that this research is still only feebly aimed at forming qualitative indicators for assessing the individual and the collective.

For instance, the principle of electing the leader is considered positive just because a representative from a group of candidates is elected to the role of leader. There is democracy and the possibility of comparisons and competition. But here is the result: The question of whether the candidates are in general capable of being leaders and of whether they meet any qualitative criteria is, with rare exceptions, not raised. Yet the main problem is not "electing" but "selecting." Following a package of qualitative and objective parameters. It is these parameters which scientists must find and define.

There have been qualitative studies of the psychophysiological features of the young people coming to serve in the army. They show that the young recruits can theoretically be divided into three groups: those with a strong will, an average will, and a weak (unstable) will. The third group is virtually incapable of actions in a complex, particularly dangerous situation, in extreme conditions like those that occurred in Chernobyl. The people in this category are bad at enduring the hardships of military service and violate military discipline. But even people with an unstable mentality acquire a good tempering in the Army and by the end of their service many of them can be transferred to the category of average or even strong personalities.

But, I repeat, that is later, after a certain degree of tempering and breaking up of their character. At the same time the early "diagnosis" of the personality in the process of its collective education—in the kindergarten, school, and labor collective—makes it possible to form more purposefully and with greater effectiveness the qualities so necessary to every young man.

I made this digression to return again to the participation of representatives of the Armed Forces in the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. I must say that the immediate backup for and fulfillment of specific operations required that the command and engineering cadres—from soldier to general—substantially increase their knowledge in the sphere of military chemistry and physics. Chernobyl showed that in a complex radiation situation, and it is for this situation that troops must be trained to make a decision, the commander needs not only will power, resolve, and courage but also the ability to understand all this complexity, the ability to understand the most diverse, sometimes contradictory, information, and to precisely analyze all intelligence and scientific forecasting data, the ability to discuss collegially the tasks facing the subunits and to elaborate ways of resolving them.

The commander's activity in collecting and analyzing information in the Chernobyl situation was essentially scientific, the sole difference being that a minimum amount of time was allocated to considering his decisions. An excellent reaction to the changing situation, the ability to think creatively, fundamental engineering and technical training, I would even say a conscious resolve—those were the qualities demanded of the military leader in those days.

Here are some further thoughts to which the subject of Chernobyl invariably impels me. Scientists today are called on to resolve tasks which sometimes go beyond the framework of their purely scientific interests. In Chernobyl, for instance, the "fundamentalists" resolved specific practical tasks immediately on the spot and worked as applied scientists, as technicians and designers. This was justified. Now, in the period of restructuring, the substantiated, optimal nature of decisions made in the country for a long period and affecting all aspects of man's life depend on scientists. And what if we take a look at the future?

So today it is simply essential to have a more powerful impetus to developing the country's intellectual potential, to imparting a leading role in society to that section of society which brings about scientific and technical progress, that is the avenue which ultimately creates material, consumer benefits for the working people and a shield of defense capability.

In speaking of the new political thinking, we turn to concepts like the principle of sufficiency for defense, sufficiency of armament, and an optimal military equipment policy. Since that is so, it means the role of each new model of military equipment and armaments and their standard of execution increases immeasurably. Consequently, the making of the decision to create each of them should be ensured by high-quality, systemic scientific developments in various fields. In setting tactical technical targets for the development of new types of armaments and equipment, military scientists and engineers and all specialists should, through these demands, encourage the development of fundamentally new technologies and materials and new design solutions. Thus compelling all production to rise to the top world standard and to promote scientific and technical progress.

Lizichev, Others Sign Zub Obituary

PM0305102188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 First Edition p4

[Unattributed obituary of Major General Ivan Grigoryevich Zub, retired]

[Excerpts] Major General Ivan Grigoryevich Zub, retired, has died after a long, serious illness. He devoted all his conscious life to selfless service to the socialist motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, in whose ranks he had been since 1931.

I.G. Zub was born 29 February 1909 in the village of Ozeryany, Varvinskiy Rayon, Chernigov Oblast. [passage omitted]

In postwar years I.G. Zub headed the political directorate of the Baku Air Defense District and later the Moscow Air Defense District and from 1962 through 1970 was chief of the V.I. Lenin military-political academy air defense troops faculty. [passage omitted]

A.D. Lizichev, A.I. Sorokin, A.N. Soshnikov, V.S. Nechayev, G.A. Stefanovskiy, N.F. Kizyun, A.G. Sitnikov, F.S. Stepanov, V.V. Serebryannikov, A.P. Zhuravlev, P.I. Ryntsev.

Briefs

General Promoted

By decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet the military rank of army general has been conferred on Colonel General Konstantin Alekseyevich Kochetov. [Text] [*LD300257 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Apr 88*]